

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES.

Baltimore, May, 1902.

THE TENT SCENE IN *Richard III*.

THE play of *Richard III*, written in Shakespeare's youth and under the direct inspiration of Marlowe's example, bears the marks of the earlier poet's influence. We feel Marlowe in the too powerful centralization of the play on one dominant figure, in the high lyric key in which passion is pitched, in the lack of symmetrical development in any principal character, in the note of the superhuman which is heard so insistently throughout. Critics have commented on this often enough, and have frequently selected for especial condemnation the third scene of Act v, the tent scene on Bosworth Field, or rather that part of the tent scene in which the ghosts of Richard's victims rise out of the night to curse him and to predict his defeat.

This scene has, however, its artistic as well as its moral right in the drama. Without doubt, its key is high; but it comes late in the play, when we have become so accustomed to extreme tension of feeling and situation that its added pressure is hardly felt as overpressure. Torn from its connection with the events which have led up to it, it may appear overstrained, but in the play as a whole, and especially in the fateful suspense of Act v, it has not only its moral, but its artistic justification.

Through the earlier part of the drama, crime after crime has been planned and carried out by Richard; from the little princes to Buckingham no weakness and no strength has disarmed his purpose, and from Anne of Warwick to Hastings no one of his victims has fathomed his deceit until too late. The course and extent of his villainy have been of more than human proportions; we cannot speak of progress in crime, but rather of accumulation of crime.

In the third scene of the fourth act, however, that accumulation has reached its climax; Richard hears from Tyrrel the news of the boy-princes' death, and in a soliloquy of eight lines both sums up what he has accomplished

and announces his next move. This he does, not in bald or half-formulated sentences of cool realization or hesitant acknowledgment, but with zest:

"The sons of Edward sleep in Abraham's bosom:
And Anne my wife hath bid the world good night."

He is poetical, metaphorical, Scriptural, as he himself said of himself. His deeds are not mere shifts for practical immediate ends; they are works of art, and as such deserve from him a mention which has literary quality.

The dramatist's recognition of this moment as the climax of Richard's villainy is indicated by the immediate entrance, upon this speech, of the first step in the return action; a messenger announces that Ely has fled, that Buckingham is up. Not at once, however, does the retrograde movement continue; two checks or retarding moments appear; Richard persuades the widowed queen to listen to his suit for his niece the princess Elizabeth;—and Buckingham is captured. Coincident with the latter news, however, come the tidings of Richmond's landing, and as we reach the third scene of Act v, we find the two armies, Richard's and Richmond's, encamped on opposite sides of Bosworth Field, around their leaders' tents.

In this scene, as the action lessens and the stage clears, the tension increases. At first we have anticipations of the coming day; Richard gives his abrupt and clear-headed orders; Richmond receives the anxious greetings of Stanley; the pitch of the scene lowers as we pass from the quick commands of the King to the hurried furtive promise of Stanley. Night settles upon the field; the tone of the play becomes lower and slower as Richmond commends his cause to God, and falls asleep in his tent. At that moment the slackening action ceases to move.

On the other side of the stage sits Richard, alone in his tent, with ink and paper before him. He has refused supper; he is not so cool as he was when earlier he bade Tyrrel reserve the account of the princes' death till he had supped. As silence falls upon the stage, and movement ceases, the suspense reaches the full.

Through the last few scenes the balance in which Richard's fortunes lie has been vibrating. The steady rise of its index was at one point, the news of Ely's flight, arrested, and since then has trembled from good omen to ill omen and back again; now events hang suspended. We ask ourselves as we look at the two men before us what we are to anticipate. Richmond we hardly know. We saw him for a moment, a lad of promise, in "Henry VI"; we have heard of him from time to time in this play, at first as a distant and then as a gradually-nearing threat to Richard. Richard we know. On his head there lies a matchless burden of crime; but the dauntless poise of that head, the daring ease with which the burden is carried, has all through the play commanded our unwilling and fascinated admiration. Such integrity of evil has seemed to justify its own existence.

If now the battle ensued at once, and Richard fell by the hand of Richmond, but half of poetic justice even would be done. The death of Richard, the mere cessation of his malign existence, would be no working out, either morally or æsthetically, of the problem which the drama has been presenting. A restoration of the disturbed balance is required, even if we speak solely from the æsthetic standpoint, in order to attain that harmony which is characteristic of the great art-product. The man before us has not only violated all human law, he has vaunted his independence of all earthly ties. In Part iii of "Henry VI" he declared of himself (Act v, Sc. 6):

"I have no brother, I am like no brother;
And this word 'love' which greybeards call divine,
Be resident in men like one another,
And not in me; I am myself alone."

And he has proved that alienation from our common humanity by his every act.

The pendulum must now swing back; the balance must be restored. The battle later is a mere epilogue; Richard can die fighting, and no one doubts his bravery; Richmond can succeed him, and no one doubts his claim; but what we crave to see is the detailed and convincing restoration of harmony, to see the sword of justice formally committed to Richmond's hand, and to hear the indomitable and loveless Richard cry out:

"I shall despair, there is no creature loves me."

Through the silence of the tent scene now pass before Richard's eyes and ours the ghosts of his victims. Each one is there. No one greater sufferer speaks for all; but as they died, so they reappear, singly, recalling one by one the crimes that have been enacted one by one before us, and clinching each remembrance with the curse to Richard and charge to Richmond. Those who have in life been powerless against Richard give now irresistible strength to the hand of Richmond. Men, women, children, kings, princes, brothers, wife, kinsmen, friends, they lay on Richard their curse, and solemnly commit to the sleeping stranger, Richmond, their vengeance. No mere right of birth is on the morrow to back up Richmond's claim to the crown. He is the last Lancastrian as well as the first Tudor; but in his hands is now laid, by every murdered Yorkist, the sword that Richard of York had turned against his own house. The Wars of the Roses may end historically with the battle of Bosworth Field and the victor's marriage; but they end dramatically with this appeal of the dead Yorkists to their hereditary foe.

As we look the figure of Richmond grows in importance. Richard no longer dominates the stage. He is no longer the moving spirit of the action, but is passive in the grip of a fate as pitiless as himself. He is to die; but that is to him, and to us, and to the dramatist, nothing. What is here presented is everything:—that each of his victims is to strike him with Richmond's arm, and that he is to realize, in the few moments of horror as the vision passes away, his own bondage to the humanity he had scorned. We see the consecration and ennobling of Richmond as fit adversary to the hitherto redoubtable Richard, from whose grasp victory is withdrawn. We see the iron Richard forced to confess the human needs he had denied and despised; and his cry of despair, as he first feels his lack of all earthly ties, as he first shrinks from the solitude on which he had prided himself, makes us realize, like the knocking at the gate in *Macbeth*, the awful pause during which our ideas of life had been deranged as we watched with fascination a creature who set the world

at naught. Richard becomes human in that cry; our vision returns to us. The spell is broken; the balance is restored.

A comparison of this scene with such hints as exist in the chronicle and in the *True Tragedy* will show how clearly Shakespeare recognized these points and how deliberately he made them. Holinshed says:

"The fame went, that he had the same night a dreadfull and terrible dream; for it seemed to him, being asleepe, that he did see diverse images like terrible divels, which pulled and haled him, not suffering him to take anie quiet or rest. The which strange vision not so suddenlie strake his heart with a sudden feare, but it stuffed his head and troubled his mind with manie busie and dreadfull imaginations. For incontinent after, his heart being almost damped, he prognosticated before the doubtfull chance of the battell to come; not using the alacritie and mirth of mind and countenance as he was accustomed to doo before he came toward the battell. And least that it might be suspected that he was abashed for feare of his enimies, and for that cause looked so pitouslie; he recited and declared to his familiar friends in the morning his wonderfull vision and fearful dreame."

In the old play (Hazlitt: *Shakespeare's Library*, vol. 5) the King has a monologue of which the first part runs as follows:

"The hell of life that hangs upon the Crowne,
The daily cares, the nightly dreames,
The wretched crewes, the treason of the foe,
And horror of my bloodie practise past,
Strikes such a terror to my wounded conscience,
That sleep I, wake I, or whatsoever I do,
Meethinks their ghoastes comes gaping for revenge,
Whom I have slaine in reaching for a Crowne.
Clarence complains, and crieth for revenge.
My nephues bloods Revenge, revenge, doth crie,
The headless peeres come preasing for revenge.
And every one cries, let the tyrant die."

From such fragmentary hints Shakspeare built up the tent scene. His additions are, if we put it briefly, the presence of Richmond, with the detailed committal of Nemesis to his hand, and the cry of Richard on realizing his kinship with the humanity he had scorned. And these are the very things that make the scene the capstone of the tetralogy and the consummation of the play. The tent scene does not only dignify and dedicate the founder of the House of Tudor and close the long and bloody war of kinsmen for the crown; but it completes what would else have been incomplete; in humanizing Richard it restores to us and to the play that balance which had been so long disturbed.

ELEANOR P. HAMMOND.

University of Chicago.

HEINE AND WILHELM MÜLLER.

II.

MÜLLER.

- 1817 (Frauentaschenbuch), 1821 (77 Gedd.),
Thränenregen, i, 11:
Wir sassen so traulich beisammen
Im kühlen Erlendach.
Wir schauten so traulich zusammen
Hinab in den rieselnden Bach.
Der Mond war auch gekommen,
Die Sternlein hinterdrein,
Und schauten so traulich zusammen
In den silbernen Spiegel hinein.

Und sahe sie nicken und blicken
Herauf aus dem seligen Bach
Die Blümlein am Ufer, die blauen,
Sie nickten und blickten ihr nach.
Und in den Bach versunken
Der ganze Himmel schien.

HEINE.

- 1822 (L. I. 42), i, 81:
Mein Liebchen, wir sassen beisammen,
Traulich im leichten Kahn.
Die Nacht war still, und wir schwammen
Auf weiter Wasserbahn.
Die Geisterinsel, die schöne
Lag dämmrig im Mondenglanz. . .
1823 (Hk. 7), i, 98:
Wir sassen am Fischerhause
Und schauten nach der See.
1820? (Gedd. 1822, Rom. 20), i, 55:
Wenn der Mond beginnt seinen Strahlen-
lauf,
Dann schwimmen die Sternlein hinterdrein.
1820-21, *Almansor*, ii, 276:
Güldne Sternlein schauen nieder,
Mit der Liebe Sehnsuchtwehe;
Bunte Blümlein nicken wieder,
Schauen schmachtend in die Höhe,
Zärtlich blickt der Mond herunter,
Spiegelt sich in Bächleins Fluten,
Und vor Liebe taucht er unter,
Kühlt im Wasser seine Gluten.

- 1818 (Gesellschafter), 1821 (77 Ged.), *Der Neugierige*, i, 7:
 Ich frage keine Blume,
 Ich frage keinen Stern;
 Sie können mir nicht sagen,
 Was ich erfür so gern.
 O Bächlein meiner Liebe,
 Wie bist du heut so stumm!
- 1818 (Gaben der Milde), 1821 (77 Ged.), *Wo hin?* i, 5:
 Was sag' ich denn vom Rauschen?
 Das kann kein Rauschen sein:
 Es singen wohl die Nixen
 Dort unten ihren Reihn.
- 1818 (Gesellschafter), 1821 (77 Ged.), *Erster Schmerz, letzter Scherz*, i, 15:
 Die Fensterscheiben glänzen
 Im klaren Sonnenschein,
 Und hinter den Fensterscheiben
 Da sitzt die Liebste mein.
 Ein Jäger, ein grüner Jäger,
 Der liegt in ihrem Arm. . .
- 1818 (do.), 1821 (77 Ged.), *Die böse Farbe*, i, 16:
 Da klingt ihr Fensterlein.
- 1821 (77 Ged.), *Der Prager Musikant*, i, 40:
 Abends unter ihrem Fenster . . .
 's Fenster klirrt, es rauscht der Laden.
- 1821 (77 Ged.), *Vor ihrem Fenster*, i, 26:
 Wie freut es mich, in dunkeln Abendstunden
 Vor deinem hellen Fenster stillzustehn!
 Die Blumen, die sich an den Rahmen
 schmiegen,
 Umschlingen mir dein Bild mit ihrem
 Kranz.
 Da sitztest du, so still und unbefangen,
 Das schöne Haupt gestützt auf deinen Arm,
 Und ich bin dir so nah' mit Lust und Bangen
 Mit meiner Wünsche ungestümem
 Schwarm.
 Du schauest her, es wissen deine Augen
 Vom süßen Zauber ihrer Blicke nicht.
- 1821 (77 Ged.), *Thränen und Rosen*, i, 138:
 Vor eines Gärtners Haus.
 Da lag ein Mägdlein schöne
 Zum Fensterlein heraus.
- 1822 (Aurora f. 1823), *Des Jägers Weib*, i, 68:
 Den Kopf gestützt auf meinen Arm
 Steh' ich am Fensterlein.¹¹
- 1818 (Gesellschafter), 1821 (77 Ged.) *Trockne Blumen*, i, 18:
¹¹ Cf. Eichendorff, ed. Dietze, i, 262, *In der Nacht*,
 Frauentaschenbuch f. 1818:
 Schauend mein Herz am Fenster lauschet
 Still in die Nacht hinaus.
- 1821 (L. I. 22), i, 73 f.;
 Blumen—Nachtigallen—Sternelein,—
 Die alle können's nicht wissen,
 Nur eine kennt meinen Schmerz.
- 1824? (Rheinblüthen f. 1825), ii, 12:
 Du Lilie meiner Liebe,
 Du stehst so träumend am Bach.
- 1823 (Hk. 9), i, 100:
 Das ist kein Rauschen des Windes,
 Das ist der Seejungfern Gesang.
- 1820? (Gedd. 1822, Rom. 14), *Wassersfahrt*, i, 49:
 Ich kam schön Liebchens Haus vorbei,
 Die Fensterscheiben blinken;
 Ich guck' mir fast die Augen aus,
 Doch will mir niemand winken.
- 1816 (Hamburgs Wächter 1817), *Die Romanze von Rodrigo*, i, 508:
 Gute Nacht!—Das Fenster klirrte,
 Seufzend stand Rodrigo unten.
- 1820 (Gedd. 1822), *Die Fensterschau*, i, 48:
 Schön Hedwig lag am Fenster. . .
 Hinschmachtend nach Hedewigs Fenster.
- 1822 (L. I. 57), i, 88:
 Ich seh' sie am Fenster lehnen
 Im einsamen Kämmerlein;
 Das Auge gefüllt mit Thränen,
 Starrt sie in die Nacht hinein.
- 1823 (Hk. 13), i, 102:
 Wenn ich an deinem Hause
 Des Morgens vorüber geh',
 Wie freut's mich, du liebe Kleine,
 Wenn ich dich am Fenster seh'.
- 1823 (Hk. 29), i, 109:
 Ich sitze am Fenster und schaue
 Hinaus in die Dunkelheit.
- 1823 (Hk. 60), i, 122:
 Dort oben am hellen Fenster
 Bewegt sich ein Schattenbild.
 Du schaust mich nicht, im Dunkeln
 Steh' ich hier unten allein;
 Noch weniger kannst du schauen
 In mein dunkles Herz hinein.
- 1825 (Nordsee i, 2), *Abenddämmerung*, i, 164:
 Während die grossen Mädchen
 Neben duftenden Blumentöpfen
 Gegenüber am Fenster sassen.
- 1825 (Nordsee i, 10), *Seegespenst*, i, 176:
 Nur dass am untern Fenster
 Ein Mädchen sitzt,
 Den Kopf auf den Arm gestützt.
- 1822 (L. I. 23), i, 74:
 Warum sind denn die Rosen so blass,

- Ihr Blümlein alle, Wie welk, wie blass?
Ihr Blümlein alle, Wovon so nass?
1818, 1821 (do.), *Die böse Farbe*, i, 16:
Ich möchte die grünen Gräser all'
Weinen ganz totenbleich.
1822 (Urania f. 1823, Gedd. 1824), *Erstarrung*,
i, 48:
Die Blumen sind erstorben,
Der Rasen sieht so blass.
1818 (Gesellschafter), 1821 (77 Gedd.), *Der
Müller und der Bach*, i, 19:
Da halten die Englein
Die Augen sich zu
Und schluchzen und singen
Die Seele zu Ruh.
1818 (Gesellschafter), 1821 (77 Gedd.), *Des
Baches Wiegenlied*, i, 20:
Will betten dich kühl
Auf weichem Pfühl
In dem blauen krystallinen Kämmerlein,
Heran, heran Was wiegen kann,
Woget und wieget den Knaben mir ein!
Wenn ein Jagdhorn schallt
Aus dem grünen Wald,
Will ich sausen und brausen wohl um
dich her.
1821 (77 Gedd.), *Doppelte Gefahr*, ii, 18:
Tief unten in den Fluten
Da ist ein goldnes Haus,
Da ruhen versunkene Schiffer
In weichen Armen aus.¹²
- Am Ufer sitzt ein Mädchen,
Die hat ein Augenpaar,
Das droht mit Feuerflammen
Mir tödliche Gefahr.
Sie strickt an einem Netze. . .
- 12 Cf. Eichendorff, i, 319, *Der Gefangene* (Gedd. 1837):
Und um ihn thät sie schlagen
Die Arme weich und bloss,
Er konnte nichts mehr sagen,
Sie liess ihn nicht mehr los.
Und diese Au' zur Stunde
Ward ein kristallnes Schloss. . .
Es konnt' ihn keines bringen
Aus böser Zauberei.
- O sprich, mein Lieb, warum?
Warum sind denn im grünen Gras
Die blauen Veilchen so stumm?¹³
- 1822 (L. I. 20), i, 73:
Dazwischen schluchzen und stöhnen
Die guten Engelein.¹⁴
- 1821 (Gedd. 1822, Fresko-Sonette ix), i, 62:
. . . sehn' ich mich hinüber
Nach jenem Nebelreich, wo stille Schatten
Mit weichen Armen liebend mich um-
schliessen.
1821 (L. I. Prolog), i, 66:
In einen kristallinen Wasserpalast
Ist plötzlich gezaubert der Ritter.
Doch hält ihn die Nixe umarmet gar traut.
- 1824 (Harzreise), *Die Ilse*, i, 159 f:
In meinen weissen Armen,
An meiner weissen Brust,
Da sollst du liegen und träumen
Von alter Märchenlust.
Komm in mein Schloss herunter,
In mein kristallnes Schloss, . . .
Dort soll dich mein Arm umschlingen,
Wie er Kaiser Heinrich umschlang;
Ich hielt ihm zu die Ohren,
Wenn die Trompet' erklang.
1826 (Nordsee ii), *Meergruss*, i, 180:
Dort unten im klaren Kristallhaus.
1841 *König Harald Harfagar*, i, 285 f:
Der König Harald Harfagar
Sitzt unten in Meeresgründen,
Bei seiner schönen Wasserfee;
Die Jahre kommen und schwinden.
Manchmal aus seinem Liebestraum
Wird er plötzlich aufgeschüttelt.
Denn droben stürmt so wild die Flut
Und das gläserne Schloss erzittert.
Schnell beugt sich hinab die Wasserfee
Und küsst ihn mit lachendem Munde.
1830? (No. 35, ii, 20, variants ii, 498), MS.:
"Augen, sterblich schöne Sterne!" . . .
Und es sang ein kleines Mädchen,
Die am Meere Netze strickte (later: flickte).
- 13 Cf. Tieck, *Gedd.* 1821-3, ii, 175, *Lied der Sehnsucht*:
Warum die Blume das Köpfchen senkt,
Warum die Rosen so blass?
Ach! die Thräne am Blatt der Lilie hängt,
Vergangen das schön frische Gras.
14 Cf. *Wunderhorn* i, 276:
Um Ännchen sangen die Engelein.

1821 (77 Gedd.), *Das Mühlenleben*, i, 8:

Seh' ich sie am Bache sitzen,
Wenn sie Fliegennetze strickt.

1821 (77 Gedd.), *Fastnachtslied von den goldenen Zöpfen*, i, 139:

Mägdlein mit den goldnen Zöpfen,
Mägdlein mit dem goldnen Haar!

1821 (77 Gedd.), *Der Dichter als Prolog*, i, 4:
Und auch der Mond bricht aus der Wolken
Flor

Schweremütig, wie's die Mode will, hervor.

1821 (77 Gedd.), *Morgengruss*, i, 10:

Ihr blauen Morgensterne!
Ihr schlummertrunkenen Äugelein.

1820 (Frauentaschenbuch), 1821 (77 Gedd.), *Ungeduld*, i, 9:

Den Morgenwinden möcht' ich's hauchen
ein,
Ich möcht' es säuseln durch den regen
Hain.

1821 (77 Gedd.), *Frühlingsgruss*, i, 36:

Du heller linder Abendwind,
Flieg' hin zu meinem Schatz geschwind.

1821 (77 Gedd.), *Christnacht*, i, 23:

Herz, mein Herz, wie bist so selig?
Herz, mein Herz, und so allein?¹⁵

1821 (77 Gedd.), *Die Passionsblume*, i, 25:

Hast du nicht in stillen Stunden,
Heil' ge Blum, ihr zugehaucht
Das Geheimnis von den Wunden . . .

" *Morgen*, i, 34: Blumen—

Wie sie wanken, wie sie beben,
Scheu die trunkenen Blicke heben!
War's dein Kuss, der sie erweckte?

" *Die Prager Musikantenbraut*, i, 42:

Blümlein weinten die ganze Nacht.¹⁶

1821 (77 Gedd.), *Der Perlenkranz*, i, 28:

Lass auf dein Haupt mich weinen:
Tauft denn die Thräne nicht?¹⁷

1821 (77 Gedd.), *Abendreihn*, i, 34:

Guten Abend, lieber Mondenschein,
Wie blickst mir so traulich ins Herz hinein?

" *Die Prager Musikantenbraut*, i, 42:

Und 's Denken ist ein lustig Ding,
Summt leis' ins Herz hinein.

¹⁵ Cf. Goethe, i, 70: *Neue Liebe, neues Leben*:

Herz, mein Herz, was soll das geben?
Was bedrängt dich so sehr?

¹⁶ Cf. Herder, *Volkslieder*, Redlich 226: O Jüngling,
wirst du auch so schwer wie diese Blume weinen?, and
Eichendorff i, 341 (Frauentaschenbuch f. 1816): Sieh, die
Blumen stehn voll Thränen.

¹⁷ Cf. Müller's *Debora*, 1827 (Vermischte Schriften iii, 181,
256): There is lack of holy water; suddenly tears stream
from the eyes of the enraptured youth, the angel receives
them in his hands, and Maria is baptized therewith.

1823 (Hk. 50), i, 118:

Mädchen mit dem roten Mündchen,
Mit den Äuglein süß und klar.

1822 (L. I. 38), i, 80:

Der Mond brach aus den Wolken
Und grüßte mit ernstem Blick.

1823 (Hk. 40), i, 114:

Wie der Mond sich leuchtend drängt
Durch den dunkeln Wolkenflor.

1824 (*Harzreise*), *Berg Idylle*, i, 152:

Äuglein wie zwei blaue Sterne.¹⁸

1823 (Hk. 61), i, 122:

Das gäb' ich den lustigen Winden,
Die trügen es lustig fort.
Sie tragen zu dir, Geliebte,
Das schmerz erfüllte Wort.¹⁹

1821 (L. I. 17), i, 72:

Herz, mein Herz, du vielgeduldiges . . .

1823 (Hk. 46), i, 117:

Herz, mein Herz, sei nicht beklommen.

1853, *Affrontenburg*, ii, 108:

Herz, mein Herz, ström aus die Fluten . . .

1822 (L. I. 7), i, 68:

Die Lilie soll klingend hauchen
Ein Lied von der Liebsten mein.
Das Lied soll schauen und beben
Wie der Kuss von ihrem Mund.

1821 (L. I. 22), i, 73:

Und wüßten's die Blumen, die kleinen . .
Sie würden mit mir weinen.

1823 (Hk.), *Almansor*, i, 146:

Thränenflut aus lichten Augen
Weint die Dame, sorgsam sinnend,
Auf Almansors braune Locken . . .
Und er träumt: er stehe wieder,
Tief das Haupt gebeugt und triefend,
In dem Dome zu Corduva.²⁰

1821 (Gedd. 1822, Lieder 3), i, 31:

Da kam das alte Träumen
Und schlich mir ins Herz hinein.

1823 (Hk. 27), i, 108:

Gelächelt ins Herz hinein.

" (Hk. 47, 49), i, 118:

¹⁸ Cf. *Wunderhorn*, ii, 193: Sie hat zwey blaue Äugelein,

Sie glänzen wie zwey Stern.

¹⁹ Cf. *Wunderhorn* ii, 50, *Luftelement*:

O Luft, du edles Element,
Führ hin mein Liedlein behend . . .
Klopf leise an das Thor,
An meiner Fillis Ohr.

²⁰ Cf. *Wunderhorn*, i, 72, *Die Nonne*:

Aus ihren schwarzbraunen Äugelein
Sie ihm das Weihwasser gab (im Grabe).

- 1821 (77 Gedd.), *Entschuldigung*, i, 37:
Schauen Augen, blau' und graue . . .
- 1821 (77 Gedd.), *Des Postillons Morgenlied vor der Bergschenke*, i, 39:
In dem Walde steht die Schenke
Einsam auf dem höchsten Berg,
Durch den Schornstein bläst die Hexe,
Und im Keller wühlt der Zwerg.
Aber sie, die flinke Dirne,
Weiss mit Geistern umzugehn.
- 1821 (77 Gedd.), *Seefahrers Abschied*, i, 43:
Und es fragen mich die Freunde,
Was ich doch so traurig bin.
- 1821 (Urania f. 1822), *Hirteneuer in der römischen Ebene*, i, 70:
Die Abendnebel sinken
Hernieder kalt und schwer,
Und Todesengel schweben
In ihrem Dampf umher.

Gehüllt in meinen Mantel . . .
Schau' ich empor zum Berge
Und träume mich beglückt.
(Hüttchen—Mädchen—Grab)

Er steigt so grün und helle
Hervor aus grauem Duft,
Wie eine Zauberinsel
In wogenblauer Luft.

- Ich schau dich an, und Wehmut
Schleicht mir ins Herz hinein. . .
So schleicht das Bild sich leise
Hinein in meinen Traum.
- 1828 (N. F. 12), i, 208:
Schleicht sich wieder, himmlisch quälend,
In die kaum genesne Brust.
- 1831 (*Kitty* viii), ii, 33:
Das Abendrot und deine Augen,
Sie strahlen mir traurig ins Herz hinein.
- 1844? *Childe Harold*, i, 268: ²¹
Seine blauen Augen schauen . . .
- 1824, *Berg-Idylle*, i, 152, 155:
Hier dagegen ist es einsam
Auf der kalten Bergeshöh', . . .
Kleines Völkchen, Wichtelmännchen,
Stehlen unser Brot und Speck . . .
Und die Katz' ist eine Hexe,
Denn sie schleicht bei Nacht und Sturm
Drüben nach dem Geisterberge.
- 1823 (Hk. 2), i, 95:
Ich weiss nicht, was soll es bedeuten,
Dass ich so traurig bin. ²²
- 1823 (Hk. 7), i, 98:
Die Abendnebel kamen,
Und stiegen in die Höh'.
- " (Hk. 12), i, 101:
Der Abend kommt gezogen,
Der Nebel bedeckt die See;
Geheimnisvoll rauschen die Wogen,
Da steigt es weiss in die Höh'.
Die Meerfrau steigt aus den Wellen . . .
- 1822 (L. I. 58), i, 88:
Gehüllt im grauen Mantel
Reite ich einsam im Wald.
Und wie ich reite, so reiten
Mir die Gedanken voraus;
Sie tragen mich licht und lustig
Nach meiner Liebsten Haus . . .
Was willst du, thörichter Reiter,
Mit deinem thörichtem Traum?
- 1823 (Hk. 71), i, 128:
Wie dunkle Träume stehen
Die Häuser in langer Reih';
Tief eingehüllt im Mantel
Schreite ich einsam vorbei.
Mit ihren Reizen und Küssen
Erwartet mich Liebchen jetztund.
- 1825 (Nordsee i, 4), *Die Nacht am Strande*, i, 167:
Und er hüllt sich fest in den grauen Mantel
Und schreitet rasch durch die wehende Nacht.
- 1822 (L. I. 42), i, 81:
Die Geisterinsel, die schöne,
Lag dämmrig im Mondenglanz;
Dort klangen liebe Töne,
Und wogte der Nebeltanz.

²¹ First printed *Neue Gedd.* 1844, but almost certainly written 1824, when Heine was deeply moved by the report of Byron's death; see his letter to Moser, June 25, 1824.

²² Cf. Goethe, *Trost in Thränen*, i, 86: Wie kommt's, dass du so traurig bist, Da alles froh erscheint? *Wunderhorn*, i, 210: Wie kommt's, dass du so traurig bist Und gar nicht einmal lachst? Brentano, *Schriften*, ii, 174: Was mag dich nur betrüben, Dass du so traurig denkst?

- 1821 (77 Gedd.), *Thränen und Rosen*, i, 138:
Ein Knäblein ging spazieren
Wohl um die Abendstund'
In einem Rosengarten,
Da blühten Blümlein bunt.

Du hast ja auch geweinet,
Dein' Auglein sind so nass;

Eine Thrän' fiel aus dem Fenster,
Da wuchs eine Ros' im Gras.²³

- 1821 (77 Gedd.), *Schifferreigen*, ii, 16:
Es kommt ein Schwan gezogen
Des Abends auf der Flut.
Ich will am Strande liegen,
Es träumt sich da so gut.

- 1821 (Urania f. 1822), *Der Mondsüchtige*, i, 61:
Hinein in ihre Kammer
Mit aller Strahlen Flut!
Wo ist der Mond geblieben?
So later *Der Mond*, i, 161: Mond, du kannst
ins offene Fenster in die kleine Kammer
sehen.

- 1821 (do.), *Heimkehr*, i, 63:
Schwalben kommen hergezogen—
Setzt euch, Vöglein, auf mein Dach! . .
Baut in meinen Fensterräumen
Eure Häuschen weich und warm.

- 1822 (Urania f. 1823), *Gute Nacht*, i, 46:
Es zieht ein Mondenschatten
Als mein Gefährte mit.

- 1822 (do.), *Frühlingstraum*, i, 56:
Ich träumte von bunten Blumen,
So wie sie wohl blühen im Mai:
Ich träumte von grünen Wiesen,
Von lustigem Vogelgeschrei. . .
Da ward mein Auge wach:
Da war es kalt und finster. . .
Ich träumte von Lieb' um Liebe,
Von einer schönen Maid,
Von Herzen und von Küssen. . .
Nun sitz' ich hier alleine
Und denke dem Traume nach.
" *Der Lindenbaum*, i, 48:

²³ Cf. *Wunderhorn*, i, 257: Ihr Auglein waren nass; and i, 285 f: Perlen aus den Augen schiessen, Schiessen hin ins grüne Gras. . . Nur der Boden wohl erquicket Dankend ihm entgegen schicket Rosen rot und Lilien blank. So Brentano, *Ich wollt' ein Sträusslein binden* (Ponce de Leon 1804): Da flossen von den Wangen Mir Thränen in den Klee, Ein Blümlein aufgegangen Ich nun im Garten seh'.

- 1822 (L. I. 43, first form), i, 519: Zauberland—
Wo bunte Blumen blühen
Im goldnen Abendlicht. (Later, i, 82:
Wo grosse Blumen schmachten).

- 1823 (Hk. 12), i, 101:
Dein Auge wird trüber und nasser,
Du schöne Wasserfee!

- 1822 (L. I. 2), i, 66:
Aus meinen Thränen spriessen
Viel blühende Blumen hervor.

- 1823 (Hk. 19), i, 105:
Wo einst ihre Thränen gefallen,
Sind Schlangen hervorgekrochen.

- 1822 (L. I. 59), i, 89:
Es singt der Schwan im Weiher
Und rudert auf und ab.

- 1823 (Hk. 9), i, 100:
Im Arm des holden Kindes
Ruh' ich allein am Strand.

- 1839? *Die Nixen*, i, 276:
Am einsamen Strande plätschert die Flut,
Der Mond ist aufgegangen,
Auf weisser Düne der Ritter ruht,
Von bunten Träumen befangen.

- 1823 (Hk. 22), i, 106:
Die Jungfrau schläft in der Kammer,
Der Mond schaut zitternd hinein.²⁴

- 1822 (L. I. 53), i, 86:
Wenn ich ein Schwalbe wäre,
So flog ich zu dir, mein Kind,
Und baute mir mein Nestchen,
Wo deine Fenster sind.

- 1823 (Hk. 4), i, 97:
Die Schwalben, deine Schwestern, . . .
Sie wohnten in klugen Nestern
Wo Liebchens Fenster sind.

- 1823 (Hk. 71), i, 128:
Der Mond ist mein Begleiter,
Er leuchtet mir freundlich vor.²⁵

- 1822 (L. I. 41), i, 81:
Mir träumte von einem Königskind,
Mit nassen, blassen Wangen;
Wir sassen unter der grünen Lind',
Und hielten uns lieb umfangen.

- 1822 (L. I. 52), i, 85:
Mir träumte wieder der alte Traum:
Es war eine Nacht im Maie,
Wir sassen unter dem Lindenbaum,
Und schwuren uns ewige Treue.
Das war ein Schwören und Schwören aufs
neu',
Ein Kichern, ein Kosen, ein Küssen. . .

²⁴ Cf. Uhland, *Volkslieder* 98, 1844-5: Der mond der scheint so helle zu liebcs fensterlein ein; and Goethe, *An Luna*, i, 49.

²⁵ Cf. Brentano, *Schriften* ii, 201 (1817):
Gibt der Stern, den ich gesehn,
Mir nicht weiter das Geleite.

Am Brunnen vor dem Thore
Da steht ein Lindenbaum;
Ich träumt' in seinem Schatten
So manchen süßen Traum.²⁶

1822 (Taschenbuch z. gesell. Vergn. f. 1823),
1824 (Gedd. ii), *Der ewige Jude*, i, 60:
Der müde Wanderer dieser Welt,
Ein sicher Ziel ist ihm gestellt;
Was klagt er ob des Tages Not?
Vor Nacht noch holt ihn heim der Tod.
O Mensch, der du den Lauf vollbracht,
Und gehest ein zur kühlen Nacht. . .

1822 (Aurora f. 1823), *Der Apfelbaum*, i, 61:
"Wer schüttelt die Zweige? Es weht ja
kein Wind,
Und es spielen ums Haupt mir die Lüfte
lind."

Da gab es im See einen plätschernden
Schall,
Als hätt' es gethan einen schweren Fall. . .
"Die schönen Äpfel, so rot, so rund,
Nun liegen sie unten im kalten Grund."

"*Die dürre Linde*, i, 134:
Dort von dem grünen Lindenbaum,
Da fielen die Blätter ab.

1824 (Gedd. ii), *Letzte Hoffnung*, i, 52:
Ach, und fällt das Blatt zu Boden,
Fällt mit ihm die Hoffnung ab.

1825 (Frauentaschenbuch f. 1826), *Nachtstück*,
ii, 21:

Es fällt ein Stern vom Himmel.

1822 (Taschenbuch z. gesell. Vergn. f. 1823),
Die Schärpe, i, 133:
Und wenn ihr ihn begrabet. . .
Lasst eine Stelle frei.²⁷

1825 (Frauentaschenbuch f. 1826), *Tanzlied*, i,
67:

Und wenn eine Nadel dir
Abfällt aus dem Mieder,
Das giebt ins Herz zehn Stiche mir,
Die heilt kein Balsam wieder.

1821 (Urania f. 1822), 1824 (Gedd. ii), *Jägers
Leid*, i, 75:

Es hat so grün gesäuselt
Am Fenster die ganze Nacht—
Mein Schatz im Tannenwalde,
Hast wohl an mich gedacht?

1825 (Urania f. 1826), *Morgenlied*, i, 88:
Wer schlägt so rasch an die Fenster mir
Mit schwanken grünen Zweigen?

²⁶ Cf. *Wunderhorn* i, 61 f.: Es sah eine Linde ins tiefe
Thal. . . Worunter zwei Verliebte sassen, Vor Lieb' ihr Leid
vergassen; i, 300: Als ich zu der Linden kam, Sass mein
Schatz daneben; i, 321: Wohl uetern grünen Tannenbaum,
Allda ich fröhlich lag, In mein feins Liebchens Armen Die
lange liebe Nacht; Büsching u. v. d. Hagen, 283: Wohl
unter einer Linde Schlieft ich die Nacht, In mein feins Lieb-
chens Armen, Die ganze Nacht; Uhland, *Die Zufriedenen*
(1815), ed. Bibl. Inst. i, 28: Ich sass bei jener Linde Mit
meinem trauten Kinde, Wir sassen Hand in Hand. . . Aus
liebem Aug' ein Grüssen, Vom lieben Mund ein Küssen. . .

²⁷ Cf. *Wunderhorn* i, 53: Macht uns, macht uns ein tiefes

1822 (Gesellschafter), i, 205:
Gekommen ist der Maie,
Die Blumen und Bäume blühn. . .
Die Nachtigallen singen. . .
Ich kann nicht singen und springen,
Ich liege krank im Gras;
Ich höre fernes Klingen,
Mir träumt, ich weiss nicht was.

1824 (Hk. 87), i, 134:
Der Tod, das ist die kühle Nacht,
Das Leben ist der schwüle Tag,
Es dunkelt schon, mich schläfert,
Der Tag hat mich müd' gemacht.

1822 (L. I. 59), i, 88:
Es fällt ein Stern herunter
Aus seiner funkelnden Höh'! . . .
Es fallen vom Apfelbaume
Der Blüten und Blätter viel.
Es kommen die neckenden Lüfte
Und treiben damit ihr Spiel.

1822 (L. I. 25), i, 75:
Die Blätter fielen, der Rabe schrie hohl.

1831 (*Kitty* iii), ii, 31:
Das gelbe Laub erzittert,
Es fallen die Blätter herab.²⁸

1822 (L. I. 32, i), 77:
Mein süßes Lieb, wenn du im Grab,
Im dunkeln Grab wirst liegen,
Dann will ich steigen zu dir hinab. . .

1822 (L. I. 34), i, 78:²⁹
Und wenn ich nur das Kisschen wär',
Wo sie die Nadeln steckt hinein!
Und stäche sie mich noch so sehr,
Ich würde mich der Stiche freu'n.

1824 (Harzreise), *Berg-Idylle*, i, 153:
Tannenbaum mit grünen Fingern
Pocht ans niedre Fensterlein.

Grab. . . Da will ich bey meinem herzlichsten Schatz, In
seinem Arm erstehen; Eichendorff i, 324 (1816): *Das kalte
Liebchen*: "Lass mich ein, mein süßes Schätzchen!"
"Finster ist mein Kämmerlein." . . "Weh, es bricht mein
junges Leben!" "Mit ins Grab hinunter muss."

²⁸ Cf. *Wunderhorn* i, 321: Die Blätter von den Blumen,
Die fallen nun auf mich; iii, 253 (Claudius, *Der verschwun-
dene Stern*): Es stand ein Sternlein am Himmel. . . Das
Sternlein ist verschwunden; Büsching u. v. d. Hagen, 283:
Die Blätter von der Linde, Die fielen auf mich: Dass mich
mein Schatz verlassen hat, Das kränket mich.

²⁹ This is one of the seventeen lyrics reviewed by Müller;
see p. 104 of this Journal.

1827 (Lyrische Reisen), *Die Muscheln*, ii, 19:
Ein kleines Fischermädchen,
Zum Küssen gross genug. . .

1826 (Urania f. 1827), *Himmel und Meer*, i, 98:
So ist mein Herz dein Meer, sein Himmel
du.
Wann gönnest du den Wogen endlich
Ruh'?

" *Vineta*, i, 102:
Aus des Meeres tiefem, tiefem Grunde
Klingen Abendglocken dumpf und matt. . .
Aus des Herzens tiefem, tiefem Grunde. . .

A great poet, as Goethe saw and said, can afford to be, indeed can hardly help being, a great borrower, and it is no derogation to that notoriously great borrower Heine to have pointed out some of his indebtedness to one brother poet. For Heine is certainly not guilty of the sort of thing he lashes unmercifully in the *blöde Jüngerschaft* of Goethe: *das matte Nachpiepsen jener Weisen, die der Alle gepfiffen* (Elster vii, 256). In the matter of metrical effect, too, Heine's lyrics are a shining monument to the truth of his own saying: *Auch die Metrik hat ihre Ursprünglichkeiten, die nur aus wahrhaft poetischer Stimmung hervortreten, und die man nicht nachahmen kann* (letter to Immermann, April 25, 1830). There is verily no need of vindicating Heine's essential originality of both matter and manner as over against Müller, who was himself a chronic borrower³⁰ and far more conventional than Heine. It is a characteristic difference between the two poets, for example, that Heine, one of the greatest of German satirists and a brilliant epigrammatist, avoids the traditional form of the epigram, while the gentle and good-natured Müller manufactures stereotyped epigrams by the hundred. From the first, Heine recognized with unerring judgment just what Müller had to teach him, and we have seen that he was both a diligent and a grateful pupil, though one who had the power to outdo his master. And the sincerity of Heine's letter to Müller is fully vindicated.

JOHN SCHOLTE NOLLEN.

Iowa College.

³⁰ P. S. Allen in MOD. LANG. NOTES xiv, No. 6, and in the *Journal of Germanic Philology* ii, 283, iii, 35, 431.

1823 (Hk. 8), i, 99:
Du schönes Fischermädchen,
Treibe den Kahn ans Land;
Komm zu mir und setze dich nieder,
Wir kosen Hand in Hand.

Mein Herz gleicht ganz dem Meere,
Hat Sturm und Ebb' und Flut. . .

1830, ii, 72:
Im Mondenglanze ruht das Meer. . .
Wo aus dem Meeresgrunde klingt
Glockengeläut und Beten.

THE OPENING OF BOCCACCIO'S LIFE OF DANTE.

BOCCACCIO begins his *Life of Dante* with a reference to Solon. This, in the translation by Smith (*Yale Studies in English*, X), runs as follows:

'Solon, whose bosom was reputed a human temple of divine wisdom, and whose sacred laws are manifest proof to modern men of ancient justice, used frequently to say, as some relate, that all republics, like men, walk and stand on two feet. With sound judgment he declared the right foot to be the punishment of every crime, and the left the remuneration of every virtuous deed. He added that if either of these two things through carelessness or corruption be neglected, the republic that so acts must unquestionably walk lame; and that if she should be so unfortunate as to sin against both these canons, almost certainly she could not stand at all.'

This would appear to have been amplified, with the addition of the figure, from Cicero, *Epist. ad Brutum* i. 15. 3 (ed. Baiter and Kayser):

'Ut Solonis dictum usurpem, qui et sapientissimus fuit ex septem et legum scriptor solus ex septem; is rem publicam contineri duabus rebus dixit, præmio et poena.'

With the statement in Stobæus (*Florilegium* 43. 76) Boccaccio can not, of course, have been acquainted:

Σόλων ἐκείνην εἶπεν ἀρίστα τὴν πόλιν οἰκῆσθαι, ἐν ᾗ τοὺς ἀγαθοὺς ἄνδρας συμβαίνει τιμᾶσθαι, καὶ τὸ ἐναντίον ἐν ᾗ τοὺς κακοὺς ἀμύνεσθαι.

A curious reflection of Solon's maxim may be found in *Gulliver's Travels*, to this effect:

'Although we usually call reward and punishment the two hinges upon which all government turns, yet I could never observe this maxim to be put in practice by any nation except that of Lilliput. Whoever can there bring sufficient proof that he hath strictly observed the laws of his country for seventy-three moons hath a claim to certain privileges, according to his quality and condition of life, with a proportionable sum of money out of a fund appropriated for that use; he likewise acquires the title of *snillball*, or *legal*, which is added to his name, but doth not descend to his posterity. And these people thought it a prodigious defect of policy among us, when I told them that our laws were enforced only by penalties, without any mention of reward. It is upon this account that the image of Justice, in their courts of judicature, is formed with six eyes, two before, as many behind, and on each side one, to signify circumspection, with a bag of gold open in her right hand and a sword sheath in her left, to show that she was more disposed to reward than to punish.'

ALBERT S. COOK.

Yale University.

ARTHURIAN NOTES.

1. *Chapalu*. In "Bataille Loquifer" figures a monster of this name, a cat-headed creature who, according to André de Coutances, played an important part in the Arthurian romance of his day (*Hist. litt. de la France*, xxii, 536, xxx, 219). According to the *Chanson de geste*, Renoart is carried by fairies to Avalon, where, at the command of Arthur, in order to test his valor, he is attacked by Chapalu, who is kept in a cistern (as a maritime demon maintained in his element); in the course of the encounter, the beast is able to attain the object of his craving, a draught of blood from the heel of his antagonist, and by this remedy is restored to human shape, of which he has been deprived by enchantment (Le Roux de Lincy, *Le livre des légendes*, p. 246, ff.). It has escaped the keen observation of Prof. Child, that the fiend, who in No. 30 of *English and Scottish ballads* is enclosed in a hogshead in the palace of king Cornwall, and does battle with a knight of Arthur, seems to be none other than Chapalu, or at any rate one of his kind.

2. *Gawain*. Scholars who have treated of this knight have failed to notice the most natural interpretation of the proper name. William of Malmesbury mentions Walwen as

king of Walweitha or Galloway; he evidently understood the knight as an eponymous hero, and so the appellation may really have been; Walweia, Walweianus, Walwen, as in Geoffrey of Monmouth Locrin from Loegria. Walgainus, in Geoffrey, is son of Lot; the descent is accounted for by the usual association of Lothian and Galloway. If this be allowed, it follows that the genealogical system was neither traditional nor ancient, but literary and in the twelfth century modern; for Galloway was not one of the old Scottish provinces; on the contrary, the name of the region was formed from that of the invading occupants, *Gall Gaedel* or foreign Gael, as in Irish phrase was called the insular population of mixed blood, half Scot, half Norse, but in manners and conduct more closely affiliated with the latter. The odd result would be, that the typical hero of "British" fiction would not in truth represent a Briton, but be of Irish name and semi-Teutonic parentage.

WILLIAM WELLS NEWELL.

Cambridge, Mass.

MINOR NOTES ON CHAUCER.

House of Fame 183-184:

How Creusa was ylost, allas!

That deed—ne wot I how—she was.

The Globe edition furnishes the reading *ne wot* for the *not* of the Mss., but it is to be noticed that the reading of F. and P., *that dede not*, is equally good rhythmically. On the other hand, the reading of B., *that ded not*, produces a line in exact rhythmic agreement with its companion in the couplet. The question of the rhythm may, therefore, be dismissed, and Skeat's inserted *but* confidently cancelled. But the substitution of *rede* for *ded* in the printed editions Cx. and Th. is in attestation of the somewhat unusual construction of the second line, and this is its chief point of interest.

It is surely not mere coincidence that the corresponding description of the loss of Creusa in the *Aeneid* (ii, 734 f.) is also involved in syntactical vagarity. The doubtful construction of *misero* (l. 576), the rivalry between *fatone* and *fato mi*, the use of *seu*, and the mood of the verbs which appear to depend upon *incertum* (l. 740), these points have been much discussed

by the critics,¹ so that the commentary upon the passage in question might well have served to arrest the attention of the editors of Chaucer. It should not have escaped observation that Chaucer's curiously constructed line reproduces much of the effect of the construction of the original by the oddly placed and interrupting *not I how*, the equivalent of the oddly placed *incertum*.

Complaint Damours 12:

Ye han me cast in thilke spitous yle,

"The allusion is to the isle of Naxos" says Prof. Skeat, to which Chaucer alludes "at least thrice in a similar way." But these three instances relate directly to the story of Ariadne and, therefore, disprove the accuracy of the phrase "in a similar way." It is difficult to believe that this "synonym for a state of hopeless despair" (Skeat) involves a specific reference to Naxos rather than to Delos or any other isle. It would be equally consistent to require Florent to name the island to which he would banish his bride (Gower, *Confessio Amantis* i, 1578). This figurative use of island is, of course, grounded in the experience of life and of legend.

Complaint Damours 15-18:

Sooth is, that wel I woot, by lyklinesse,—
If that it were a thing possible to do
For to acompte your beautee and goodnesse,—
I have no wonder thogh ye do me wo;

The second and third lines are by way of an apologetic parenthesis, and at the same time epexegetic of the phrase *by lyklinesse*. However, *lyklinesse* is here equivalent in sense to *lyknesse*, 'likeness,' 'resemblance' (cf. the obsolete uses of *likeliness* and *likelihood*), and the phrase means 'in the matter of resemblance,' or 'by comparison.' The passage may, therefore be translated thus:

'The truth is (I can't deny it), when I compare myself with you,—if indeed it were possible to measure your beauty and goodness,—I am not surprised that you cause me distress.'

Complaint Damours 81:

Sonne of the sterres bright and clere of hewe.

From the line thus emended (*sterres* for *sterre*) it was an easy step to the careless re-

¹ Mr. B. A. Wise, a member of my Seminary, refers me to a discussion of these lines by Schroeter in *Jahresbericht des Königlichen Gymnasiums zu Cr.-Strehlitz*, O. S., 1874-75, p. 7.

port of Mss. F. and B., *sterre so bright*. The poet is employing, by metaphor, the figure of *micat inter omnes*, which, by simile, occurs in the *Book of the Duchesse* 817-829, and in the *Parl. of Foules* 298-301. The same figure is heightened into the extravagant contrast of *Anelida and Arcite* 71-73.

The suggested reading may to some minds furnish a presumption in favor of also restoring the "omnes" of the figure in the passage from the *Parlement* by reading *Passeth the sterres*. The matter is somewhat doubtful.

Complaint unto Pite 29-35:

But yet encreseth me this wonder newe,
That no wight woot that she is deed but I,—
So many men as in her tyme hir knewe;
And yet she dyed not so sodeynly,
For I have sought her ever ful besily
Sith I first hadde wit or mannes mynde,
But she was deed er that I coude hir fynde.

I beg to call attention to this punctuation of this stanza; it differs from that of the editions, though agreeing in the main with that of ten Brink's (*Essays on Chaucer*, p. 171). The parenthetic affirmation (in construction akin to the simple absolute) of the third line unites it with what precedes not with what follows. This may be illustrated by a possible modern *as*-clause: 'I am surprised to hear that this has now happened,—as many men as have been trying to prevent it.' In this same construction are ll. 110-111 of the *Complaint to his Lady*: *And so hool, swete*, etc.

It will be observed that the remaining four lines of the stanza now become clear and logical after the removal of the semicolons of Prof. Skeat's text.

JAMES W. BRIGHT.

ROMANCE VERSIFICATION.

Die Technik des romantischen Verses von
OSKAR MÜLLER. Berlin: E. Ebering, 1901.
96 pp. Leipzig diss.

It seems rather strange that up to the present day there is no thorough study of the verse-technique of Victor Hugo nor of any of the Romantic poets; and now, in one monograph, we are offered what purports to be an exhaustive investigation of the four principal poets of the Romantic school: V. Hugo, Lamartine, de Musset, de Vigny. Unfor-

tunately, however, the work under review is a disappointment, for the following reasons: 1. its bibliographical inadequacy; 2. the endeavor to compass too vast a field in its treatment; 3. lack of a thorough knowledge of the subject of versification on the part of the author; 4. much useless work here presented, work that belongs in a treatise of verse.

The bibliography which the author has consulted is meager in the extreme, consisting of only thirteen works; among these, Tobler, Becq de Fouquières, de Banville are frequently referred to, Tobler being the author's basis. To mention the bibliography of V. Hugo alone, necessary to a study such as this purports to be, would take up too much space. The reviewer is of the opinion that no investigation of this nature is conclusive, or even valuable, if it does not examine *all* the works of an author and these in chronological order, as far as this is possible; this has not been done in the present thesis. Especially in V. Hugo would such a study bring out many points of interest in the development of verse-technique and make possible many valuable chronological comparisons in the use of the hemistich and overflow. For such a study the works of Biré become invaluable, and these have not been consulted by Müller.

The subject is treated under eight headings: 1. syllable count; 2. hiatus; 3. overflow; 4. cesura; 5. rhythm; 6. rhyme; 7. euphony; 8. meaning of words.

Under each of these headings the rule, or rules, as posited by Tobler, are quoted and the exceptions cited. It may be said at this point, that throughout this thesis too many data are presented as apparently new, but which are so well known that they give the work the appearance of an elementary treatise rather than of an original investigation; all these facts might have served as an introduction to the monograph.

Verse bibliography shows that no poet is consistent in the use of monosyllabic and disyllabic words; such words as *hier*, etc., may be either. To devote fourteen pages to such a comparatively unimportant and even useless investigation seems a pity. That *ce* and *je* are not elided, that *le* is used before a vowel and not elided nor counted as a syllable are

facts that we seek in a treatise of versification.

The thirteen-syllable verse in *Cromwell* ii, 10, l. 13, is interesting.

The conclusion from this study is that V. Hugo is more conservative than de Musset, clinging closer to tradition; Lamartine belongs to the modern poets because he uses *voient* in the interior of the verse. The writer, however, doubts the validity of such an assertion.

With regard to the use of hiatus the author finds that the poets examined, for the most part, observe the law of hiatus more closely; de Musset is somewhat lax; but outside of the familiar *ça et là, peu à peu, une à une*, only one case of hiatus is noted, the famous—*folle que tu es*.

In the works examined, a few of each poet, Müller discovers that V. Hugo and de Musset indulge in the use of the overflow frequently and possibly too frequently. In *Cromwell* 2%, in *Hernani* 3½% are irregular or non-classical overflow lines. It would certainly be interesting to have statistics of all of Hugo's works in chronological order. The discoveries of Müller have long been well known facts.

The term cesura in French versification is no longer used; hemistich has replaced it. This chapter on cesura forms one of the most interesting and valuable chapters of the monograph. Müller states that he has found only a few cases of possessive and demonstrative pronouns, articles and monosyllabic prepositions at the hemistich; even *si* is objectionable and one example is cited, p. 38; but such lines are frequent, for example:

Hideuse, comme si le même coup d'épée.

Outside of these facts, which, if true of all the works of Hugo, would be interesting, too much space is given to discussing points of no value. The conclusion is again a known fact—the Romantic poets preserve the classical hemistich in the main, by preserving the sixth syllable stressed.

As to rhythm, six pages are required to explain the difference between the classical and Romantic verse. The results obtained are not conclusive because they hold only for a few works. The reviewer differs from Müller and others in the fundamental analysis of a French Alexandrine; he believes that every verse ought to be read as classical unless the logi-

cal sense and the verse rhythm require that it be otherwise read. Thus, on this basis, for example, p. 56, out of twelve lines six are perfect classical Alexandrines. To cite two lines given as Romantic:

Laissez.—Tous ces enfants sont bien là.—Qui vous dit.

Pleure. Les pleurs sont bien, même au bonheur; tes chants.

From this view-point the statistics, as given by the author, would be lower by at least 40%. The works which the author has examined of V. Hugo belong to his first period of authorship: in the *Odes et Ballades* 1/10%, in the *Orientales* 1%, in the *Feuilles d'Automne* 1 2/5% are Romantic lines. Of the 2176 lines in *Hernani* 175 are Romantic; Dr. Matzke's results are quite different; he finds 553 Romantic lines. Müller evidently did not know of this investigation.

As striking rhymes in V. Hugo, the following are cited: mer-blasphemer; apostasier-hier. They are frequent in Lamartine; one example in de Musset and Vigny. Monsieur-crieur found in Hugo and Lamartine. Rich rhyme is more frequent in the Romantic than in the classical poetry; but these statistics are based on only a few poems. In V. Hugo rich rhyme is used especially in poems in which beauty of form is aimed at.

General conclusion: the Romantic poets, in the main, adhere to the general laws of versification; we have occasional variations. Hiatus law is strictly observed. French verse received from the Romantic school, especially from V. Hugo, a greater pliability and freedom by the free use of the hemistich, frequent use of overflow, and rich rhyme.

From this review we are led to the question: What results are here obtained? The answer is, the work *est à refaire*. The most serious defect is the failure to consult and apply verse bibliography, and to examine all the works of the poets under question and in chronological order.

HUGO P. THIEME.

University of Michigan.

ENGLISH LITERATURE.

The Works of Thomas Kyd. Edited from the original texts, with introduction, notes, and facsimiles. By FREDERICK S. BOAS, M. A. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1901. 8vo, pp. cxvi, 470.

THE edition of Kyd's works by Prof. Boas will

be of very great service to students of the Elizabethan drama. During the past few years the way has been prepared for such a collection by the biographical researches of Prof. Schick and Mr. Sidney Lee; by many investigations in respect to Kyd's authorship of various plays, notably Prof. Sarrazin's *Thomas Kyd und sein Kreis*; and by scholarly editions of the *Spanish Tragedy* by Prof. Schick and Prof. Manly. In a long introduction Prof. Boas has discussed and added to the results of these preceding investigators. While many problems in regard to Kyd are perplexing and do not admit of conclusive demonstration, Prof. Boas has in general shown accuracy and judgment in his discussion of conflicting evidence, and a thorough knowledge of the work of his predecessors, except of Prof. Manly's edition of the *Spanish Tragedy*, which strangely enough is not even mentioned. Particularly interesting is his discussion of Kyd's biography. He has discovered among the Harleian MSS. documents bearing on the charges of atheism made against Kyd and Marlowe shortly before the death of the latter. Kyd appears in the unenviable position of casting all the blame upon Marlowe. The chief value of the book, however, naturally lies in the trustworthy texts of the *Spanish Tragedy*, *Cornelia*, *Soliman and Perseda*, the *House holders Philosophie* (a translation from Tasso), the *Murder of John Brewen*, and the *First Part of Jeronimo*.

Prof. Boas has retained the spelling of the original texts and carefully collated all extant editions. A comparison of his texts with those in volume V of Hazlitt's *Dodsley* affords an interesting illustration of the advance made in the last thirty years in this field of English scholarship. It is to be hoped that the bulk of the Elizabethan plays may eventually be reprinted with similar accuracy. In one or two particulars, however, there is room for a word of criticism. Prof. Boas in a few cases changes the spelling of proper names in order to preserve uniformity. It is difficult to see what advantage there is in uniformity of spelling Elizabethan proper names. On the other hand, Mr. Fleay and Mr. Boyle have found in different spellings of the same name indications of different authors. While the value of this test may not be well established, still any variation in text which may offer the slightest aid to critical research might well be retained.

In the division of the plays into acts and scenes Prof. Boas's practice is also open to question. The main purpose of the division into scenes in a modern edition is to facilitate reference; but in the four modern editions of the *Spanish Tragedy* we have four different arrangements. Reference to the play is consequently not facilitated in the least. Prof. Boas differs in only a few cases from Prof. Manly and Prof. Schick, but these cases raise questions on which there might well be a consensus of opinion for the benefit of future editors of Elizabethan plays. The Choruses at the beginning or end of each act are marked as scenes by Boas and Schick but not by Manly, whose practice is in accord with precedent in the case of Shakespeare. Several other divergences will be noted; Schick certainly is contrary to Elizabethan custom in marking scene xv in Act iii; the preference between the divisions of Manly and Boas is hard to determine. The notes supplied by Prof. Boas for the texts are excellent.

In regard to the most debated questions of authorship, he comes to the conclusions that Kyd was the author of *Soliman and Perseda*, and the *Ur Hamlet*, but not of the *First Part of Jeronimo*.

Of the last conclusion he is the most certain and advances a number of arguments in addition to those proposed by Dr. Rudolf Fischer against Kyd's authorship. The *First Part of Jeronimo* seems to Prof. Boas utterly unworthy of the author of the *Spanish Tragedy*, very different from that play in style and characterization, and incompatible with it in the account of the love affair of Andrea and Bell-imperia. Differences in style and characterization cannot be considered of much weight in the case of an author known by one play, especially when we remember similar differences in the plays of Greene, or the two parts of the *Honest Whore*, or in the plays of other dramatists. Prof. Boas's other arguments are, if anything, less conclusive.

The entries in Henslow's *Diary* for 1592 indicate, as Prof. Boas concludes, that there was a companion piece to the *Spanish Tragedy*, produced by way of introduction on the afternoon

¹ Zur Kunstentwicklung der Englischen Tragödie. Strassburg, 1893.

before, or a day or two earlier. It is styled by Henslow, "the comodey of done oracio," "the comodey of Jeronimo," "spanes comodye donne oracoe." The version of the *First Part of Jeronimo* which we have was printed in 1605, the year in which the Queen's Revels (Children of the Chapel) were in serious difficulties and in which a number of their plays were printed.² The allusions to the short stature of Jeronimo show that the play was acted by a children's company, and we learn from the Induction to the *Malcontent* that the Queen's Revels had misappropriated *Jeronimo* (either one or both of the *Jeronimo* plays). The date when the *First Part* was first acted by the children probably was not 1604, as Boas assumes, for the *Malcontent* was acted 1603-4 in retaliation³ by the King's men, and *Jeronimo* must have been acted earlier by the children of the chapel—probably about 1600 as stated by Fleay⁴ and Small,⁵ and as indicated by the allusion to the year of Jubilee (1600) in Act I, scene I.

The play, as we have it, then, seems likely to be the early "comodey of Jeronimo," altered and abridged for the children. Alterations may be found in the references to *Jeronimo*'s size and the year of jubilee, surely on no "purely arbitrary hypothesis" (Boas xlii). Indications of abridgment are the shortness of the play, less than one-half the length of the *Spanish Tragedy*, the combination of a short and a long line in rhyming couplets, and the very short parts assigned to some important personages. Don Pedro, Duke Medina, Vol-lupo, and the Duke of Castile have but a few words each. Some of the divergences between the *First Part* and the *Spanish Tragedy* may be plausibly laid to such abridgment, especially the failure of the *First Part* to set forth the secret nature of the love of Bell-imperia and Andrea—a divergence to which Prof. Boas attaches great importance. He observes:

² In 1605-6. The Dutch Courtesan, All Fools, Eastward Ho, the Fleire, the Fawn, the Gentleman Usher, Isle of Gulls, Monsieur D'Olive, Sir Giles Goosecappe, Sophonisba.

³ Cf. *The Stage Quarrel between Ben Jonson and the Poetasters*. R. A. Small, 1899, pp. 114-5.

⁴ *Chronicle of the Drama*, ii, 27. Fleay finds a plausible argument in a reference in *Cynthia's Revels*.

⁵ Small, *The Stage Quarrel*, etc., p. 124, note.

"when Lazarotto reveals the whole story in the presence of Castile, [Bell-imperia's father] the Duke utters no word of surprise or anger" [xlii].

But the only words which the duke utters in the whole course of the play are, "I, Don Rogero" (i, 1). The part had presumably been greatly cut. Now, the *Spanish Tragedy* refers to many events prior to the opening of the action and these cannot be said "to relate chiefly to the secret love between Andrea and Bell-Imperia" [Boas, xli.], but rather to the whole love-affair, the war and the death of Andrea. Whatever discrepancies may be noted between the two plays, nevertheless the *First Part* does present in the main the story of the events which the *Spanish Tragedy* requires. Surely, then, we are justified in accepting the 1605 quarto as representing the companion piece of the *Spanish Tragedy* of 1592.

Whether this version in any way represents Kyd is a more complex question, but the facts of the stage-history incline one to exercise much more caution than does Prof. Boas in rejecting it as spurious. The natural inferences from those facts seem to forbid his endorsement of the conclusion of Rudolf Fischer,

"that it is the work of a journeyman playwright who found in the Induction to *The Spanish Tragedy* hints from which he manufactured this crude melodrama, whose title served as a decoy to the theatre-going public, and which has had the effect, doubtless unforeseen by its author, of fatally injuring the fame of Kyd." [Introduction xliv.]

When a few pages later on the evidence of an allusion to "Cues and Cees," Prof. Boas declares, "Some 'wit' reared at Cambridge was responsible for *The First Part of Jeronimo*," one must note this as one of the very few occasions when he has confused doubtful conjecture and fact.

His discussion of *Soliman and Perseda* is not open to this charge. On the contrary, the evidences, wholly internal, are presented with a discriminating sense of their values. The chief objection to assigning the play to Kyd is the character of Basilisco. If we must rely on æsthetic opinions, many will probably find it easier to believe that Kyd wrote a good deal of the melodramatic *First Part* than to believe that even with the aid of classical prototypes

he could have created this admirably humorous braggart, whom Prof. Schick has with justice called "by far the most remarkable Elizabethan precursor of Falstaff." Prof. Boas, however, credits Kyd with "Sophoclean dramatic irony" and other traits not very evident to most of us; consequently he makes little difficulty of Basilisco and concludes that the play was by Kyd or—less probably—a disciple.

In the discussion of the *Ur-Hamlet*—as in that of *Soliman and Perseda*—while Prof. Boas agrees with Sarrazin's main conclusion, he submits the evidence advanced by the latter to a thorough reconsideration. He rules the German *Bestrafte Brudermord* out of consideration, resting on Tanger's conclusion

"that this piece is nothing more than a version of the *First Quarto*, with probably a few later additions due to actors familiar with Shakespeare's play in its later form" (xlvi).

Even if Tanger's criticism of Creizenach's analysis seems more conclusive than it does to the present writer, it is still difficult to believe that the pirated and mangled *First Quarto* was largely responsible for the German play. The hypothesis that it goes back to the *Ur-Hamlet* seems more plausible; and the theory that the *Ur-Hamlet* was by Kyd in the style of the *Spanish Tragedy* adds considerably to the probability of this hypothesis. Whatever view is assumed in regard to the German play, however, there is plenty of chance for objection; and Prof. Boas's course at least has the advantage of ruling that troublesome abridgment out of the discussion. It has, on the other hand, the very serious disadvantage of compelling him to confine the internal evidences of Kyd's authorship of the *Ur-Hamlet* to the resemblances between Kyd's plays and the *First Quarto*. The resting of any case on the *First Quarto* is precarious business, and this part of the introduction will doubtless encounter much dissent, especially from those who find it difficult to believe that there is anything in *Hamlet* not due to Shakespeare's genius. Even those who agree with Boas in finding resemblances to Kyd in the quarto will have some trouble in accepting his sweeping statement:

"The bulk of the blank verse in the three later Acts is, in my opinion, unmistakably pre-

Shakespearean. The vocabulary and the rhythm are not those of the master-dramatist at any stage of his career, while in Kyd's works they may be frequently paralleled" (Introd. xlix).

His list of parallels, however, is certainly valuable and, perhaps, as convincing as such evidence can be.

The main evidence for Kyd's authorship is, of course, Nash's allusion in his Epistle to Greene's *Menaphon*. Boas makes rather too much difficulty out of phrases which Prof. Ward has thought to point to Kyd as expressing "the University man's contempt for Latin not learnt on the Cam or Isis."⁶ Though Prof. MacCallum has recently summed up effectively the objections to Kyd,⁷ most students now probably agree with him that the balance of evidence is in favor of Kyd. Prof. Boas has added to the evidence offered by Sarrazin, but the case for Kyd still stands substantially where Sarrazin left it. Nash's allusion fits Kyd better than anyone else. The early *Hamlet* in plot and general character was probably similar to the *Spanish Tragedy*. Similarities to Kyd may plausibly be discovered in the *First Quarto*, the German play, and for that matter in Shakespeare's *Hamlet*.

The nature of Shakespeare's treatment of the early play is a problem too complex for discussion here, but we may note a dissent from the conjectures of Prof. Boas in regard to the history of the early play. The allusions to it, covering fifteen years, indicate a greater popularity than he grants it. Moreover, while it "probably underwent in manuscript form a certain amount of adaptation," we can by no means assent to the surmise that its "popularized stage version" which Shakespeare had for a basis,

"would have had something of the same relation to the *Ur-Hamlet* as Ayler's German adaptation of the *Spanish Tragedy* has to its original" (liii note).

This conjecture is as unfounded as it is unnecessary. Boas is driven to it because "we do not find in the *Quarto* some features of style characteristic of the author of *The Spanish Tragedy*" (liii). But why should we? Almost

all "features of style" are lacking in that production. The early *Hamlet* may have been as much altered as the *First Part of Jeronimo* seems to have been, or it may have had as unmolested an existence as did many other Elizabethan plays, which remained for years in MS. So far as probabilities go, we may conjecture that if Kyd wrote a *Hamlet* in 1588, Shakespeare was tolerably familiar with the play and could have found a fairly integral copy in 1601.

In discussing the *Spanish Tragedy*, Prof. Boas is on less debatable ground. This is the one play which we can certainly ascribe to Kyd, at least until some ingenious critic twists Heywood's lines. If the authorship, however, is settled, the date is not. Prof. Boas concludes that the evidence suggests a date 1585-7, but he does not consider an interesting question which this early date raises. *Tamburlaine* is generally assigned to 1587, and if the *Spanish Tragedy* preceded *Tamburlaine*, we must make some important changes in our notions of the extent and importance of Marlowe's innovations. If the *Spanish Tragedy* with its blank-verse, its central heroic figure, its partial success in infusing passion into an old narrative, its blood and thunder, its soliloquies, and its "high astounding terms," preceded *Tamburlaine*, Prof. Boas would be justified in giving much more attention than he does to Kyd's influence on Elizabethan tragedy. As a matter of fact, the evidence for the date is very uncertain and by no means forbids a later date than 1587.

In examining this evidence, Prof. Boas has surely been led into an error in thinking that

"when Nash speaks of the authors who 'attract infection' by spending 'two or three howers in turning over French *Doudie*' he may be referring to Kyd's imitation"

of a passage in *Cornelie* (Int. xxix). He has perhaps been misled by an unfortunate passage in Prof. Schick's introduction to the play. He declared that in Nash's jest, "a splendid vista of literary connection is opened to our imagination,"⁸ and

"there is hardly any doubt that the passage in the main refers to the translation of certain

⁸ *The Spanish Tragedy*, ed. by Schick. Introd. xiii. The whole passage is a notable example of perverted ingenuity.

⁶ *A History of English Dramatic Literature*, ed. 1899. i. 312, note.

⁷ *The Furnivall Miscellany*. "The Authorship of the Early *Hamlet*," p. 282 ff.

plays in French by the head of the French Senecans, Robert Garnier."

He also indulged in an astonishing identification of 'Dowdy' and 'Didon'; "the Dowdy may refer to a play with the title 'Didon'—Jodelle's, for instance (cf. 'Dido a Dowdy,' *Romeo and Juliet*, ii, iv, 43)." The meaning of 'Dowdy' is plain enough as the passage from *Romeo and Juliet* might suggest, and the rest of Nash's joke has an unmistakable meaning which need not be dwelt on. Surely there is no literary reference. If one must look for literary connections, attention might be called to Mr. Fleay's mention of a parallel passage in Greene's Address prefixed to *Perimedes* (1588), alluding to Marlowe and possibly Kyd as "too much frequenting the hot-house;"⁹ this is enough to recall the abundance of such "unpleasantries" as Nash's in Elizabethan plays and pamphlets.

In general, it may be added, Prof. Boas is somewhat too eager to find something in Kyd's career to fit every word of Nash's oft-discussed paragraph. It may possibly refer to more than one dramatist; and at all events our knowledge of Kyd's life is still too meagre to enable us to determine all the references with any certainty. Mr. Fleay's example ought to be a warning against exercising too much ingenuity over Elizabethan allusions.

It may be questioned, however, whether Fleay's theories in regard to Kyd should be dismissed as summarily as they are by Boas. No subject in connection with the Elizabethan drama offers a more valuable field for research than the works of Mr. Fleay; the first step in any investigation may well be to search out what he has discovered, conjectured, misplaced, or forgotten. His ascription to Kyd of the *Taming of the Shrew* might at least have received some attention. Prof. Boas barely mentions this and occupies only three pages in rejecting *Titus Andronicus*, partly on the ground of "a significant difference of atmosphere" between it and the *Spanish Tragedy*. Apart from the suggestion that Kyd may have influenced for the better Marlowe's technique and construction of plots during their association 1590-2, the rest of the discussion of Kyd's influence on the drama is confined largely to

⁹ *Chronicle of the Drama* ii, 31-2.

tracing parallel passages and allusions to the *Spanish Tragedy*. After such a list of parallels in Shakespeare, we are surprised to learn that "his debt to Kyd is scarcely, if at all, less than to Marlowe himself" (p. lxxxiii). But the real extent of this indebtedness is hardly hinted at. Shakespeare and the rest of the Elizabethan dramatists owe more to Marlowe than to Kyd, but they owe much to the innovator who adapted Seneca into a genuine English drama, and who created an important type of tragedy. The influence of Kyd's technique and his choice and treatment of dramatic motives might be traced in the plays of Marston, Chapman, Tourneur, and Webster as well as Shakespeare. The omission of any mention of *Antonio and Melinda* in Prof. Boas' discussion is at least curious. But he does not see fit to pay much attention to Kyd's historical position and importance, either his relation to the preceding followers of Seneca or his influence on succeeding authors of 'revenge' tragedies.

This neglect is not because of a slight estimate of Kyd's genius. On the contrary, the introduction exhibits an enthusiastic and sympathetic appreciation of both his work and his personality. We may find the enthusiasm justified which defends the *Spanish Tragedy* against the contempt which it has frequently received, for the play has irony, and a sense of fate, and some genuine passion. But Prof. Boas occasionally forgets that its dramatic art is crude, and that it is aesthetically interesting more for what it tries to express than for what it actually achieves. In a single page (xxxvii) we are told that "Kyd displays incontestable dramatic genius," that "he reproduces something of that Sophoclean dramatic irony which is among the crowning glories of the Attic stage," that

"beneath the ripple of gay discourse on so trivial a theme as the arrangements for an amateur performance we catch the solemn undertone of an ever-nearing catastrophe."

In the epilogue, we learn,

"echoes of Virgilian music temper the harsher strain, and glimpses are given us of Hieronimo and his loved ones amidst the Elysian fields—glimpses that help to make us less forlorn" (p. xxxix).

May not the discovery of such emotions in so wooden a production as the *Spanish Tragedy* be attributed to the Pathetic Fallacy?

Kyd himself has become a very real figure to his editor. From the meagre facts of his career, a picture is drawn to move our pity. His plays are found to illuminate his personality. He is discovered to have been "a man of sombre and rigid temperament"—possibly on the external evidence of Nash's jest already alluded to, and the internal evidence in the character of Basilisco. He had a "quickened sensibility of vision into the darker phases of human character and destiny;" and this inference we may more surely refer to the character of Lorenzo, in which Prof. Boas takes a psychological interest. Some readers may find relief from the careful examination of facts and balancing of evidence in such flights into the region of sentimental fancy. The funeral oration pronounced on Kyd (pp. lxxvii, lxxviii) is certainly both imaginative and eloquent.

Other readers will not have enough sensibility of vision to seek in the plays of Kyd for either hidden gems or indications of the author's view of life; and these will regret that Prof. Boas has occasionally abandoned the historical point of view for that of modern æsthetic criticism. His aberrations in literary judgment, we must hasten to add, give only a momentary annoyance and by no means affect an appreciation of the painstaking and judicious scholarship manifest throughout the book. And if this review has emphasized some points which occasion dissent, instead of dwelling on the many additions which have been made to our knowledge of Kyd, it is only because even slight corrections and trivial criticisms seem worth noting in the case of a book which must in many respects serve as a model for future editors of the dramatists.

In the note on the Earl of Gloucester's invasion of Portugal (p. 397) mention should be made of the play "the Honorable Life of the Humorous Earl of Gloster, with his conquest of Portugal" (Henslow's *Diary*, 1601) and of the reference to this expedition at the end of *Look About You* (cf. Fleay, *Chronicle* ii, 226, 227). References to Tanger's discussions of the first quarto of Hamlet in *Anglia* and the *Transactions of the New Shakspeare Society*, might well accompany the reference to his article in the *Shakespeare Jahrbuch* (xlvi). The statement that in Lorenzo "the Machiavellian 'politician' makes his entry upon the Eliza-

bethan stage" (xxxiii)—might well have a reference to the discussion of this matter by Dr. Edward Meyer in his *Machiavelli and the Elizabethan Drama*. The quotation from Nash (xx, xxi) is without reference. The entry for "7 of jeneverary" (p. xl) in Henslow's *Diary* occurs twice in Collier's edition; on p. 79 for £7 and on p. 84 for £3. On p. xxxi, l. 15; for i. x, read i. i. 10. On p. xciv, l. 12; for iii. ii, 43, read iii. xi, 43.

A. H. THORNDIKE.

Western Reserve University.

GERMAN LITERATURE.

Der Arme Heinrich by HARTMANN VON DER AUE, edited with an Introduction, Notes and Glossary, by JOHN G. ROBERTSON, M. A., B. Sc., Ph. D., London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co.; New York: Macmillan & Co., 1895. 8vo, pp. xviii, 122.*

THE editor's expression of fear (Preface, p. i), lest his edition of *Der Arme Heinrich* in English be considered superfluous and unwarranted, together with his subsequent vindication of his undertaking, call to mind such work as the translation into English of Kluge's *Etymol. Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache* and of certain German monographs and treatises on Germanic subjects, also the compiling of Grammars of Germanic dialects in the face of most excellent books on those subjects in German. One cannot help thinking, in the same connection, of the rapid multiplication of text editions and grammars, both in Germany and in this country. Existing conditions render much of this work inevitable, yet one is led to question most seriously the advisability and value of doing a large portion of it. However, the same objection that one feels here, cannot quite be urged against an English edition of *Der Arme Heinrich*, so long as, for the better or the worse, MHG. remains the first Germanic dialect to which *angehende Germanisten* are introduced, and so long as *Der Arme Heinrich* maintains its position as the first MHG. text *par excellence*. We believe, therefore, with the editor that there is room for a book like his, but the presumption in such a case certainly is with the older standard editions, and the burden of proof rests upon the new book

* See Vol. xii, 1897, pp. 93-94, of this Journal.

trying to establish a place for itself by the side of its predecessors. It should at least be reasonably free from errors, and it is in this respect that the book under discussion fails to maintain itself.

The editor, of course, makes due acknowledgment of his indebtedness to the existing editions of *Der A. H.*, of the annotations to which he makes most liberal use,—which, indeed, he at times follows so closely, that, forgetting the deviations in the readings, his Text and Vocabulary or Notes come to be at variance with each other. So, for example, in the vocabulary, p. 77, sub *alels* (which is, of course, a misprint for *alles*) his reference is to line 953. Here he borrows the note of the Wackernagel-Toischer edition (p. 109) on the word *alles* found in that text, but in his own text adopts Paul's reading which runs, with the Strassburg MS., *allen* instead of *alles* (*allez*) of W.-T. and Haupt. So also, p. 96, sub *komen* pret. subj. [this, I take it, is again an error, for *quæme* or *kæme* must be *indic.* pret., though this line is at best difficult, as is shown by the various readings of the MSS. and interpretations of editors, and W.-T.'s translation of *loch* as 'Grube, Grab' may be considered, if not incorrect, at least misleading] (*quæme*) 584 is borrowed from W.-T., while the editor's text reads with Paul *kæme*. So again, on page 76 of the Notes, he incorporates in his last annotation ll. 1523-1530 from Bech, forgetting that the latter's line-numbering differs from that of the other editions. The line-numbers should be 1513-1520.

The editor's Introduction is, on the whole, quite satisfactory. He leans, to be sure, rather conspicuously heavily on Toischer; but no one would be likely to expect him to adduce any new and original material from a field so thoroughly, not to say exhaustively, gone over by Grimm, Bech, Wackernagel, and Toischer before him. But one does miss some treatment, however brief, of the versification, especially since it is not an easy matter to refer students to a very simple treatise on this subject, which is too important to be entirely neglected. It seems that a page on scansion might well have been added. Another omission, which Toischer also makes, but which one misses more keenly in the English edition, is the failure to mention

the translation of our poem by D. G. Rossetti: *Henry the Leper. A Swabian Miracle-Rhyme: By Hartmann von Auë (A. D. 1100-1200)*, which is printed in vol. ii, pp. 420-460, of *The Collected Works of Dante Gabriel Rossetti*, 2 vols., Ellis and Elvey, London, 1890. This should be inserted on p. xviii of the Introduction, where the editor says: "A prose version in Italian by A. Barragiola (should be Baragiola), etc., seems to be the only translation into a foreign tongue." The statement on p. ii of the Preface: "the editions of Grimm, Bech, Wackernagel and Toischer" misleads students to believe that there are separate editions, one by Wackernagel and one by Toischer, as is the case with Grimm and with Bech. An unambiguous statement would be an improvement. The disparaging statements on p. xiv of the Introduction and in the note on line 681 f. (p. 65 of Notes) anent the pronounced "religious element" and "didactic tone" seem rather ill-conceived and are wholly out of keeping with the high and unstinted praise elsewhere bestowed upon the poem. Mediæval poetry cannot be judged according to the severe canons of modern literary art any more than certain elements of Greek tragedy can. If we apply rigidly the inexorable norm of modern psychology and realism, our poem becomes an insipidly stupid yarn; but if we judge it from the naïve point of view of the Middle Ages and allow the element of the miraculous its proper and normal place, we have in *Der A. H.*, as we do in Schiller's *Jungfrau von Orleans*, an inspired and inspiring poem of surpassing beauty.

The Text of this edition is based upon that of Paul (*Altdeut. Textbibl.*), Halle, 1882; 2nd edit., 1893, "but in several instances Haupt's readings have been preferred" (p. xviii, Introduction). Quite frequently, however, the editor's variants are chosen from Wackernagel-Toischer or from Bech, as in ll. 168, 330, 786, 827, 869, 870, 1115, 1134, etc. Moreover, the editor curiously *cites* the second edition of Paul above, but *uses* apparently only the first edition in his textual criticism. In a foot-note to p. xviii "the principal variants from Paul's text" are enumerated, an examination of which yields the following results: In the very first variant: "l. 24 *bitende* for *bittende*," as well

as the ones on ll. 168 and 190 *genislich* for *gnislich*, the editor has overlooked the fact, that Paul has emended the readings of his first edition in the second, so that in reality these are not variants. In l. 231 he reads *maget* with Haupt instead of the *megede* of Paul, but why adopt Haupt's *maget* here, when in ll. 1020 and 1026 *et passim* Paul's *megede* is chosen in preference to Haupt's *maget*? 370 *dem kinde*, etc., is an error; he means l. 330; 447 *erbære* for *manbære*—this is the reading of Paul's first edit.; the second edit. has *vribære*. Line 877 should read 827. I subjoin several other variants that are omitted in the editor's list: l. 225 *erbære* for *vribære* (second edit.); l. 291 *willeclichen* for *willeclche*; l. 308 *umb* for *umbe* (second edit.); l. 332 *gap* for *gab*; l. 363 the editor puts a comma at end of line with Bech and W.-T., Paul and Haupt omit it; ll. 459 and 460 *gesagt* and *magt* for *gesaget* and *maget*; l. 509 *gesweigten* for *gesweigeten* (second edit.); l. 740 *so* for *sô* (second edit.); l. 865 *sante* for *sente* (second edit.); l. 926 *iwer* for *iuwer*; l. 927 *gnâdete* for *genâdete* (second edit.) [cf. also ll. 965, 1014, 1305, etc.]; l. 935 *hülfe* for *hulfe* (second edit.); l. 959 *gerinwez* for *gerüwez* and *gerüwez* (second edit.); l. 964 *ich* for *ichn* (second edit.); l. 977 *engültentz* for *engultentz* (second edit.); l. 981 *ez* for *es*; l. 1007 *weinte* for *weinde* (second edit.); l. 1109 *hülfe* for *hulfe* (second edit.); l. 1201 *gar sêre* for *sô sêre*; l. 1275 *sinen tôl* for *sinen tôdes*; l. 1280 a, b, c, d added in second edit.; l. 1284 *unde* for *und*; l. 1284 a, b added in second edit.; l. 1296 order of words is different in second edit.; l. 1309 *st* for *sich* (second edit.); l. 1319 *al* for *alle* (second edit.); l. 1320 quite different reading in second edit.; l. 1323 *dulden* for *verdulden* (second edit.); l. 1326 *ez* for *nu* (second edit.); l. 1332 a, b, c, d added in second edit.; ll. 1339 and 1340 second edition inverts lines; l. 1353 second edit. inserts *ouch*; l. 1354 second edit. inserts *gar*; ll. 1353 and 1354 *magt, klagt* for *maget, klaget*; ll. 1493 and 1494 *gesagt, magt* for *gesaget, maget* (second edit.); l. 1500 *mir* for *ich wol*.

The chief criticism on the Notes is that the editor's translations of difficult passages are too free to be of real assistance to the thoughtful student in understanding the construction. On p. 52, note to line 13, the editor says:

"The subject of *töhte* is to be supplied from *iht* in l. 9, and in the Vocabulary he gives *daz* of l. 13 as conjunction and not as art. and pron. This is an error caused, perhaps, by a misinterpretation of W.-T.'s note to the line. This *daz* is not the conjunction 'dass,' but the relative pron. 'das' (= 'welches'), which, somewhat unlogically, is used in MHG. to introduce conditional, concessive, and modal clauses. For other passages in which the relative pronoun, the masc. and fem. forms as well, have this peculiar use, cf. ll. 202, 411, 443, 498, and in the W.-T. text also l. 741. For a fuller treatment of the subject cf. Paul, *Mhd. Gram.* §347, 1, 2, 3, and esp. 4. The subject of *töhte* is not to be supplied, therefore, but is the relative *daz*. P. 54, note to l. 74, *förperlich* should read *förperheit*. P. 56, note to l. 121, reference might have been made to Paul, *Mhd. Gram.* §305 f. and §371 f. for a fuller statement of the use of *ge-*. P. 57, note to l. 131, *sterquelinio* should, I believe, read *sterquilinio*. Without even taking cognizance of the customs in vogue at the time here described, the wind is quite taken out of the sails of the editor's argument on p. 58, note to l. 225, by the ending of our poem. P. 61, note to l. 359, is incorrectly translated. P. 61, note to ll. 372 f., *sô vil* is incorrectly interpreted as conditional; it should be causal. P. 64, l. 560 is wrongly translated. Indeed, the editor does not show familiarity with the use of *danne* (Mod.H.G. 'denn') in this construction, and of the negative *ne*, *en* with the subjunctive having the same force of 'denn', 'wofern nicht', 'es sei denn, dass', 'wenn nicht' (cf. also his transl. of *danne* in vocab., p. 82), which is so common in MHG. For this construction cf. Paul, *Mhd. Gram.* §338, and V. Michels, *Mittelhochdeutsches Elementarbuch*, §282, Anmerkung. Other cases of this usage in our poem are found in ll. 204, 560, 834, 1105, 1146, 1398, etc., only the first and last of which the editor has translated at all adequately. P. 64, l. 920 is, if not incorrectly, certainly very freely translated. P. 64, note to l. 646, B is not quoted quite correctly; it should be *lanch leben*. P. 65, note to l. 657, Tobit seems to be incorrectly quoted. P. 66, note to l. 724, the quotation from the *Nibelungenlied* is not quite accurate, and the reference to Zupitza, at least in the 5th edition, should be p. 63 in-

stead of p. 69. P. 69, l. 896 is incorrectly translated. The editor overlooks the inverted order in the text and so makes an impossible translation of the passage. P. 69, note to l. 900 might better read: *the phrases are* instead of *the phrase is*. P. 74, ll. 1330 and 1331 seem to me incorrectly translated and interpreted.

I shall add but briefly a few errors that came under my notice in the Vocabulary: p. 99 sub *micHEL*, the editor says: Compar. 603. The form *micHELRE* (l. 603) is not the comparative, but the dat. sing. fem. of the positive degree. For the form cf. Weinhold, § 502, p. 557, and for the identical form with an adj., ending in *-er* (instead of *-el*), cf. l. 109 *bitterre* and the editor's quotation from *Gregorius*, p. 57, note to ll. 155-156: *mit tötvinsterre naht* and *Büchlein* 2, 20. Likewise p. 114 sub *veste*: compar. (*vester*): 1140; this is not compar. but the inflected form of the positive. On p. 116 sub *wan*, etc., the form *wand* which occurs l. 572 should have been added.

Of misprints I note the following (aside from those that have already been pointed out): p. vi bottom and p. x bottom for *Krone* read *Kröne*; p. vi, foot-note, for 144;155 read 144-155; p. xv, second last line of foot-note, for 162 ff. read 160 ff.; p. xvii for *Jahrhunderts* read *Jahrhundert*; p. xviii, foot-note, for *siz* read *siz*. In the text l. 340 for *si* read *st*; l. 413 for *biderden* read *biderben*; l. 425 for *minen* read *minen*; l. 651 b for *werltlich* read *werltlich*; l. 662a quotation mark is omitted; l. 700 for *fürhte* read *fürhte*; l. 704 for *hat* read *hät*; l. 807 for *zu* read *ze*; l. 832 for *so* read *sö*; l. 855 for *sahen* read *sähen*; l. 863 for *si* read *st*; ll. 871 and 872 for *si* read *st*; l. 878 strike out period at end of line; l. 890 for *so* read *sö*, and for *nith* read *nicht*; l. 899 for *verveingen* read *verviengen*; l. 1006 for *sin* read *stn*; l. 1094 for *fröuwelin* read *fröuwelin*; l. 1152 omit period; l. 1206 for *st* read *st*; l. 1213 insert period at end of line; l. 1215 instead of period insert comma at end of line; l. 1264 quotation marks before and after *sprach er* are omitted, and the comma at end of line should be replaced by period; l. 1280 for *lazen* read *läzen*; l. 1386 insert period at end of line; l. 1446 strike out period at end of line; l. 1487 for *sprachen* read *sprächen*; p. 52, note to l. 21, for § 372 read § 375; p. 53, note to l. 24, for 637 read 673; p. 55, note to ll. 86-88,

for *Ps.* read *Is.*; p. 58, note to l. 225, for *vrie-bære* read *vriebere*; p. 59, note to l. 257, for pp. 162 ff. read 160; p. 60, note to ll. 312-314, for *wætliche* read *wätliche*; p. 62, note to ll. 395-396, for *tuont* read *tuot*; p. 63, note to l. 485, for 940 read 930, and, note to l. 506, for *hat* read *hät*; p. 64, note to l. 546, for *invariable* read *invariably*; p. 64, second last line, for 449 read 649; p. 65, note to l. 674, for *si* read *st*; p. 66, note to l. 729, for 14 read 24; p. 66, note to l. 775, for *frier* read *frter*; p. 68, note to l. 852, in second line of quotation from A for *helle* read *hellen*; p. 72, note to ll. 1183-1184, for *do* read *dö*; p. 73, note to l. 1196, for 1111 read 1101; p. 73, note to l. 1230: See note to l. 463 is a misprint for some other number. I was unable to find the note the editor has reference to. There is no note to l. 463; p. 75 note to l. 1460 for *und* read *unde*; p. 75 bottom for 1483-1486 read 1482-1486, and, in this same note, for *in* read *is*; p. 77 *alels* for *alles* has already been referred to; p. 78 first line of first column for *also* read *alsö*; p. 79, sub *bedenken*, for *bedachte* read *bedächte*; p. 81, sub *biten*, for *prt.* read *pret.*; p. 82 first line of first column for 756 read 576, and 13, sub *daz*, remove to sub *der*; p. 84, sub *durch*, for 1154 read 1155, and, sub *elich*, for 1452 read 1453, and *elich* itself should read *eltch*; p. 98, sub *mäc*, 474 is a misprint—the word does not occur in that line; p. 108, sub *sunne*, for *stf.* read *wf.*; p. 114, sub *verwäzen*, add 798.

It is unfortunate that so many faults and errors have crept into this book, which ought to prove thoroughly serviceable in many schools. Many instructors will naturally prefer to use the German text-books in teaching Middle High German, yet to many others this edition might seem to have distinct advantages. It is to be hoped that in future editions the errors of the first one will be corrected.

J. B. E. JONAS.

Brown University.

FRENCH LITERATURE.

Le Voyage de M. Perrichon, Comédie en quatre Actes, par EUGÈNE LABICHE et M. E. MARTIN. Edited for school use by G. CASTEGNIER, B. ès S., B. ès L., of the A. H. Cutler School. New York: The American Book Co., 1901.

THIS entertaining, instructive, and even philo-

sophical comedy by Labiche has for several years been a favorite with teachers of French, both on account of its value in language-study, and for the glimpses it affords of the life of the rich bourgeois of forty years ago. An excellent school-edition of the play already exists, but it would be a pleasure to welcome another, if the new one were in any way an improvement. Such is not the case, however, with the book in hand. The book is full of errors, seemingly following a reprint rather than an early edition, such as that of A. Bourdilliat et Cie., Paris, 1860; numerous specimens of incorrect English appear, such as: "something like everybody writes," "annexed since 1860," etc.; many translations are inaccurate, the worst perhaps being: *remonter*, "to come towards the audience," a meaning which is just the opposite of the right one; and finally, the edition is encumbered with a very faulty vocabulary, in which simple and natural renderings are, it would seem, carefully avoided. In the Introduction, consisting of two pages, several points are open to criticism: the title of the first play of Labiche, given as *M. de Goistlin*, was, according to the *Magasin Théâtral* of Marchant, Paris, 1843, *Monsieur de Coyllin*. The statement that "his plays form a collection of ten volumes, bearing the name of *Théâtre Complet*," is misleading, for out of the vast number of plays written by Labiche, only the best are preserved in his so-called *Théâtre Complet*. In two places the editor's phraseology is unsatisfactory; it is not easy to see just what is meant by: "Labiche's style is mainly comical," while the phrase in which we are told that Edouard Martin "soon crossed the threshold of the temple of fame" is so ponderous as decidedly to over-balance the seven lines devoted to the associate.

In the text itself there are several misprints: one which occurs more than once is the omission of the accent-mark in the word *ça*, while in the Vocabulary no distinction is made between *ça*, the adverb, and *ça*, the contraction of the pronoun *cela*, p. 25, l. 1; and Vocabulary. On the other hand, in two places *ça* should be *ça*, 77, 14; 79, 10. *Remerciements*, 32, 8, should be *remerciements*, or else changed to agree with the spelling of the Vocabulary, *remerciements*: both are in good use, but the

editor should confine himself to one. An important point is to change *impatiente*, 42, 22, to *impatiente*, since a difference in meaning is involved. *Fatigant*, 51, 7, should be *fatigant*, as in the edition of 1860; the adjective drops the *u*, while the participle retains it, although the meaning may be identical. An interesting and peculiar error is found, 35, 21; *mère* should read: *re, re*; that is, to call attention to the fact that Perrichon has misspelled *mer*, Daniel says: *Il a écrit mère, re, re*. Thus he spells aloud the last syllable, and then pronounces it, but does not spell the whole word. *Evènement*, 55, 4, and Vocabulary, and *événement*, 59, 1, as well as *complètement*, 78, 5, should have a consistent spelling; the *è* is preferable nowadays. The use of quotation marks, 52, 26; 53, 2; 56, 25, is unnecessary. The spelling *dalhias*, 72, 8, is found also in other editions, but is obviously incorrect, since the word is derived from the name of the Swedish botanist, Dahl; the correct form, *dahlia*, is found in the Vocabulary. Minor errata are: the capital letter in *exposition*, 60, 32; the omission of the hyphen in *là-dedans*, 21, 5; *Crusoe* for *Crusot*, 20, 31; and a few irregularities in the punctuation of exclamatory phrases, 21, 5, etc.

The editor does not state that he has made any changes in the text, yet we find several passages expurgated, while others are arbitrarily and unnecessarily altered in a way which many teachers will criticize. In act ii, scene viii, there is a perfectly allowable paraphrase of five lines, which, however, suffers by comparison with the original; but in act i, scene vii, many of the changes are unwarrantable. For instance, *Mademoiselle Anita*, 16, 16, should be *elle*; Labiche wanted to awaken the interest of the audience in the character referred to as *elle* before naming her; the effect is weakened by the substitution. *Mademoiselle Anita*, 16, 20, should be *Anita*; *redeviendra amoureux de*, 17, 4, should be *reprendra*; *Mademoiselle Anita*, 17, 22, should read: *elle! Anita!*; *reverrez*, 17, 23, should be *reprendrez*; after *jamais*, 17, 24, should be inserted *Allons! C'est bien!*; *je suis amoureux*, 38, 2, should be *j'aime*. The four or five lines which are omitted entirely, p. 17, might perhaps have been paraphrased, as in act ii,

scene viii. Throughout the play are omissions of certain harmless expletives, which are most inconsistently dealt with in this edition. The word *diable* is omitted or changed four times, 15, 18; 25, 4; 30, 4; 62, 16; *dame* is omitted once, 77, 14; *la montre* takes the place of *la diablesse de montre*, 52, 28; *Dieu* is omitted once, 8, 26. It is amusing to note that of these, *dame*, *Dieu*, *diable*, all occur in the Vocabulary, where the last-mentioned figures as "Satan," while *diable* is found twice in this text, 21, 5; 23, 25, in places similar to those in which an omission has been pointed out.

There are one hundred and fifteen Notes, of which forty-nine consist merely of a direction to "see Vocab.;" several of the others might be improved. The word *tortue*, 26, note, sometimes means "turtle," but our old friend of the Fable has for so many years been known to us as "the Tortoise," that we dislike to admit the *alias*. The residence of the Empress Josephine at Malmaison ought not to be called a "castle," p. 64; it is nothing more than a villa, a country-house. *Sel*, 26, 21, means "smelling-salts;" the context here and in scene x proves it. The English in the following places in the Notes is unsatisfactory: "revolutionary," p. 56 (for: revolutionist); "annexed since 1860," p. 77 (for: in 1860); and in the Vocabulary: "to wish good-by," p. 89; "in a low voice," p. 92: "luggage check," p. 93; "to poke one's nose in," p. 102 (for: into); "something like everybody writes," p. 109; "between us now," p. 120.

Words found in the text, but omitted in the Vocabulary: *avancé*, which has a double meaning, 82, 13; *billet*, meaning "note," 70, 7; *complètement*; *s'imposer*; *las*, (given as *lasse*); *marchande*, (given as *marchand*); *poignée*; *poudrière*; *sixième*. Incorrect or unsatisfactory renderings: *affiche*, "time-table" (a more general meaning should first be given); *pas de banque*, "no humbug;" *si l'on a eu du chagrin*, "if Anita has expressed grief" (to translate *l'on* by "Anita" spoils the effect of the question which follows: *Qui ça ?*); *bonne chance*; "happiness;" *centime*, "one-fifth of a cent," (why not: one-hundredth of a franc?); *comme ça*, to translate the passage, 77, 28; *sur le compte du hasard*, "haphazard;" *tiens*, "hello" (surely Henriette would not say that);

maman, "Mother;" *préfet de police*, "superintendent of police;" *remonter*, "to come towards the audience;" *sentimental* (this is not a satisfactory first meaning); *sieur*, "Mr." (better: one, as legal term): *voyage*, supply "journey."

Several remarks found in the Vocabulary belong in the Notes: *Bouilly*, *code*, *communication*. Other points: *dévergondage* and *deviner* should precede *devoir*; *employé* should precede *emporter*; *Français* should be *français*; *hola* should be *holà*; *si*, "if," and *si*, "yes," should be separate words. Carelessness is shown in making the English rendering cover more than is expressed by the French quoted: *cinquante ans*, "fifty years old," should be *avoir cinquante ans*, "to be fifty years old;" *endroit là*, "that very place," should be *cet endroit là*, etc.

W. O. FARNSWORTH.

Yale University.

SCANDINAVIAN BIBLIOGRAPHY.

Arkiv för Nordisk Filologi, utgivet genom Axel Kock. Register zu Band i-xvi... von AUGUST GEBHARDT. I. Lieferung. Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1901. 100 pp.

THE value of the *Arkiv* has been immensely increased by the publication of this *Register*. Although the pamphlet bears on its title-page the words *I. Lieferung*, it is hard to see what can be added to its full treatment. The arrangement is as follows. The first division, which is preceded by a page of explanation, like the rest of the rubric, in German, contains a list of original articles and reviews, arranged under the authors' names in alphabetical order. An admirable feature of this list is the attempt to give the names exactly in the form in which they occur at the ends of the articles, thus, *Brate*, *Erik*, but *Brekke*, *K*. Where a name occurs in two different forms after different articles the longer form is given, as *Ferdinand Deller*. Under *Fridriksson* the initials should be *H. K.*, not *H. Kr*. The letters are given in the order in which they occur in modern scientific German works, the non-German characters *p* and *d* being given at the end. *d* and *é*, on the other hand, are treated as variants of the corresponding German characters. Here and elsewhere, in the

case of Icelanders, in addition to the family name before the entry a cross reference is given under the christian name, as *Finnur s. Jónsson*. When more than one article follows an author's name the different articles are preceded by Arabic numerals, Roman numerals being used to indicate subdivisions of articles. Thus, under *Ebbe Hertzberg's Tivvlsomme ord i Norges gamle love*, each word discussed is preceded by a Roman numeral and is followed by the number of the page on which it begins. This method is applied even to the annual bibliographies. Throughout the *Register* the volume numbering of the *Arkiv* is continuous, no attention being paid to the division into old and new series. The wisdom of this is self-evident.

Part two contains a list of the books reviewed, arranged in the alphabetical order of the authors' names, with the names of the reviewers in brackets. The total number of reviews recorded is eighty-three. In the case of two authors the entry is given under the first, with a cross reference under the second name. Part three gives a list of the necrologies, together with the place and date of birth and death, the name of the writer being in brackets. Only nineteen entries, covering slightly over one page, are found here, but they include only the most considerable Scandinavian scholars, and few if any additional names would be entitled to a place there. It may be of interest to note that of the nineteen, four are Icelanders, five Norwegians, four Danes, three Swedes, and three Germans.

Part four is altogether the most important feature of the bibliography as it aims at giving references to all words discussed in the different articles, classified according to the languages to which they belong. This division takes up the last sixty-five pages. The largest sub-division is, of course, the West Northern, from p. 36 to p. 91, and the language most generously represented is the Swedish, from p. 63 to p. 85. On account of their large number, Swedish dialect words are given in a class by themselves, other dialect words are distinguished by daggers. Doubtful forms are followed by interrogation points. Old Norwegian are distinguished from Old Icelandic forms by an *N*. Words cited merely as ex-

amples are not given. These lists of Scandinavian words may be regarded as valuable supplements to the existing etymological dictionaries in the respective languages.

But the value of a work of this kind depends not so much upon skill of classification as upon accuracy of execution. Absolute accuracy is not looked for, is indeed hardly possible, in an undertaking of such extent and variety. As a test of the work on this crucial point several numbers of the *Arkiv*, chosen at random, were carefully examined, and the following slight inaccuracies were noted. The page references are to the *Register*. *littr* should be *littr*, p. 6: *nær-når* should be *nær-når*, p. 26: *rättskrivning*, should be *rättstävning*, p. 19. In the bibliography for 1897 occur the printer's errors *tidskrifter* and *i almidelighet*, p. 10. *Gyðingr*, 135 should be *G. 134*, p. 26. In the other parts examined not a single error was noted. Similar proof of careful work was found in connection with part four, where mistakes would be of more moment. A large number of forms was compared and only a few trifling orthographical mistakes were found.

This *Register* may be regarded as a distinct contribution to Germanic philology of that unselfish kind which will be found of value by all students of the Scandinavian languages, but which can be fully appreciated only by those who have themselves engaged in the difficult work of indexing. If other scholars are led by Herr Gebhardt's example to deal with other journals in the same generous and scientific spirit the good cause will indeed be helped.

DANIEL KILHAM DODGE.

University of Illinois.

FRENCH LITERATURE.

Le mouvement littéraire contemporain par GEORGES PELLISSIER. Plon-Nourrit & Cie, Paris: 1901. vii-302 pp.

M. PELLISSIER is one of the rare critics of our day who do not waste their whole strength in numberless magazine or newspaper articles. From time to time he feels the necessity to stop, and take a synthetic view of the field just left behind. Nothing can be more useful for men of our generation, so exclusively given

up to specialization, than such books as *Le mouvement littéraire au xix. siècle* (1890) and *Le mouvement littéraire contemporain*.

Everything seems to indicate that the success of the later volume will be as complete as that of the earlier. This is perfectly legitimate as far as the treatment of separate topics is concerned. We certainly find criticism as strikingly just and suggestive in the *xix. siècle*, as in the *Mouvement contemporain*. Bourget and de Régnier, for instance, are given as brilliant an appreciation as Sainte-Beuve, G. Sand, Flaubert, or the Goncourts. The same remarkable independence of judgment which had been highly praised ten years ago, is shown now in the author's attitude towards men like Rod and Rostand, so unduly overdone by the public. But, considered as a whole, the new work does not seem to be quite up to the standard of the first. It is not always the fault of the author. Perhaps the chief reason for it, he himself gives in his Preface:

"Le xix. siècle appartient au romantisme dans sa première moitié. C'est ensuite le réalisme ou naturalisme qui domine depuis 1850 environ jusque vers 1875 ou 1880. Chacune de ces deux écoles a successivement marqué à son empreinte la littérature contemporaine. Il y eut un état d'âme général qu'on peut appeler romantique; il y eut un état d'esprit général qu'on peut appeler réaliste" (p. v).

General views were, therefore, possible; authors could be duly classified and their works explained as manifestations of the one or the other current of thought in literature. Moreover, the second of these currents being in many respects a mere reaction against the first, a natural connection existed between the two, which constituted another element of unity in the book. But,

"dans le dernier quart de ce siècle, notre littérature n'a pas d'unité . . . Il y a eu de nos jours beaucoup d'écoles: c'est justement parce qu'aucune n'a pu s'imposer" (p. vi).

And the first words of the *Conclusion* are:

"Sauf dans l'histoire, qui, devenant objective, sort aussi de la littérature, l'évolution littéraire aboutit, de notre temps, au triomphe de l'individualisme dans tous les genres" (p. 296).

In such conditions a book on contemporary literature is bound to be more or less a mere enumeration of authors and examination of their separate works. There is, in conse-

quence, almost no connection between the different chapters; and even within the chapters themselves unity obtains only in the first few pages treating of Naturalism, which for a while continued to be in fashion, but soon, however, gave way to individualism. An exception can be made in favor of poetry, where an altogether new school has been in existence for over ten years.

We are obliged in this review to follow M. Pellissier and consider each chapter as a whole in itself.

Chap. I. *Le roman*. The first half is devoted to the last representatives of the naturalistic school. Zola, in fact, has never been a true naturalist; he has never taken nature exactly as it is, but has always adapted it to his special purposes. Our author strongly insists upon this. We frequently meet sentences like: "A vrai dire l'auteur des Rougon-Macquart ne mérita jamais le nom de naturaliste." Or: "M. Émile Zola fut de tout temps un romantique." Or again: "Il a le tempérament aussi peu naturaliste que possible." Furthermore, in the last volumes of the *Rougon-Macquart* (ended 1893) the materialism and the pessimism based upon science give way to optimism and utopianism, a tendency which only becomes more accentuated in *Les trois villes* and *Les quatre Évangiles*. Zola remains true to science, but sees in it now the instrument of progress and a cause for hope.

Maupassant and Ferdinand Fabre, rather than their master, deserve, in recent years, the name of Naturalists. And if the distinction frequently made between naturalism and realism is observed, the former meaning the faithful reproduction of nature, and the latter the artistic production based upon faithful observation of reality, Maupassant will be found to be the true naturalist, and Fabre the true realist.

There is a third kind of naturalism which M. Pellissier calls (p. 25) "naturalisme sectaire;" under the guise of sincerity and of reaction against romantic tendencies, it would emphasize the ugly side of nature. Zola at the beginning of his career indulged in it a good deal. A number of his younger disciples, of whom were Huysmans, Rod, Rosny, and Paul Margueritte, carried his theories to extremes, but after a short time abandoned them altogether.

Two causes favored the decline of French realism: the introduction in France of the English, Russian, and Scandinavian literatures (which M. Pellissier mentions only very briefly), and the so-called "banqueroute de la science," science and naturalism being for many intimately associated.

M. Pellissier is himself an admirer of realism. French art, he holds, owes much to Zola's school; something will and must remain of it:

"Quand on dit que le naturalisme fit banqueroute, on a raison si l'on veut parler du naturalisme doctrinaire et scolastique; on se trompe si l'on entend par là cette conception de l'art saine, probe, vaillante, qui consiste à rendre la nature avec autant de vérité que possible" (p. vi.).

I will try to show later that the tribute he renders to a sound realism seems to prevent him from perceiving what other literary tendencies have contributed towards progress in art.

The only "school" which can be cited, besides the Naturalistic, is that of Psychology, and the only representative of this school is Bourget. Pellissier opposes the Psychological and Naturalistic; this is hardly correct. They are parallel tendencies. Bourget was a disciple of Taine, just as Zola is. Both applied the master's theories, the only difference being that Zola takes the body, and Bourget the mind. Both are absolute determinists, as M. Pellissier himself well remarks; and once he goes so far as to say: "Le psychologisme n'est vraiment qu'une naturalisme de la vie mentale." Where, then, lies the opposition? We are further surprised to find Bourget considered as the "unique représentant" of the modern Psychological school. We should have expected to see Rod, also, classified as a psychologist. On what ground should a place be refused to the author of *Au milieu du chemin*, when one is given to the author of *La duchesse bleue*? The same argument may be maintained for others, Estaunié, for instance. If a "psychologist" writes *Le disciple*, what is the author of *L'empreinte*? The pages (45-53) on Bourget, in the work before us, are nevertheless the best I have hitherto seen.

Loti as impressionist; France as dilettante; Huysmans as "mystique sensuel;" Rod as moralist; P. and V. Margueritte as analysts;

J and H. Rosny as humanists; Paul Adam "d'intentions peu nettes" but with "certaines vellétés symboliques"; Marcel Prevost as the great casuist in "feminism" and, much more than Bourget, "romancier des mondaines;" Hervieu as the cold and severe ironist; Barrès as the subtle and after all shallow egotist; Capus as a "pince sans rire;" Estaunié as the systematic psychologist; finally, Pouvillon, Theuriot, Bazin as novelists of rustic life, are successively treated, being too different from one another to allow any classification.

Perhaps M. Pellissier has too strong an inclination to see differences. Besides Rod and Estaunié, who might very well be classed as "psychologists," we wonder why the brothers J. and H. Rosny—"peut-être le plus original de nos romanciers contemporains" [?]-are not considered as Naturalists. What is the difference between *L'impérieuse bonté* and *La charpente* on the one hand, and the novels of Zola in his second period on the other?

Chap. II. *Le théâtre*. The victory of Naturalism on the stage was won much later than in the novel. There are, M. Pellissier says, three great dates in the French theatre of the nineteenth century, those of the production of *Hernani*, of *La dame aux Camélias*, and of *Les corbeaux*. Dumas and Augier had started a reaction against Romanticism on the stage, but did not accomplish much towards realism. Their ethics were *bourgeois* and their treatment of subjects just as remote from true nature as can be imagined; the evolution of their plays reminds one of geometric theorems.

"Augier et Dumas avaient présidé, voilà quarante ans, à l'évolution réaliste de notre comédie: elle se fit d'abord avec eux, elle dut ensuite se faire contre eux."

But changes of literary standards do not take place so easily on the stage as in written works. One can think over a novel, take time to understand, and thus appreciate new ideas. On the stage one has no time to reflect: thus, the new piece must succeed at once or not at all. In vain did Goncourt, Villiers de l'Isle Adam, Daudet and Zola try to put on the stage dramas animated by the spirit of the naturalistic novel. One after the other failed. Even *L'Arlésienne*, which is realistic in the very best sense of the term, was unsuccessful. Ten years more

elapsed, and Henry Becque offered *Les corbeaux* (Sept. 14, 1882). It had just the regular representations at the Comédie française, and then had to be withdrawn. It was the masterpiece of the realistic school; but the public was not ready for it.

In 1887 the "Théâtre libre" was founded by M. Antoine, which went to the extremes of Naturalism and imposed on the Parisians the so-called *théâtre rosse*. This could not last, but because it went so far, it forced, so to speak, the attention of the public; whatever good there was in realism could henceforth remain. After a few years M. Antoine gave up the "théâtre libre" and founded instead the "Théâtre Antoine," in which no preference was given to any *genre*.

When the realistic drama had finally won the victory, it was just about the time when everywhere else other tendencies had begun to prevail. So it came that soon after Ancey, who was perhaps the best writer for the "théâtre libre," we have again a series of dramatic, or comic, authors who seem to have no aim or method in common: de Porto Riche, Lemaître, Lavedan, Brieux, de Curel, Hervieu, Donnay. The only tendency that perhaps slightly prevails is the "comédie d'analyse."

Owing to the great and noisy success of *Cyrano de Bergerac*, it is not possible to omit mention of the "drame historique," of Coppée, Hennique and Rostand. This enthusiasm is an accident, which will not last:

"il se peut bien que le drame lyrique et la comédie romanesque retrouvent place dans notre théâtre, mais comme quelque chose d'accessoire, comme une diversion passagère."

In this chapter, as in the former, the one thing which is to be regretted, is a disposition to emphasize to an unnecessary degree slight differences among the writers. It does not seem to me that the drama has undergone such radical changes since Dumas. Brieux and Hervieu, to mention only two of the most famous playwrights of to-day, have very much the same fashion of composition as Dumas, the first with his moral theories: "morale moyenne," as M. Pellissier says himself, and "qui s'inspire du sens commun;" the second, by the systematic arrangement of his dramas, which excludes any kind of incident and leads

straight to the end by a sort of mathematical deduction.

There is nothing surprising in this. Theatrical pieces that are meant for the stage will always have to fulfil certain requirements which, although entirely exterior, will forever restrict within rather narrow limits the evolutions and revolutions in the literature of the stage.

Chap. III. *La poésie*. Poetry was the *genre* most refractory to Naturalism. The naturalists in poetry were the Parnassians. However, a reaction started rather soon, about 1885, and not only have we anti-naturalists, as elsewhere, but a positive new creed in art has already been proposed. The Parnassians had banished imagination and subjectivism from their works; they aimed at an artistic, bright, but exact reproduction of reality. The Symbolists declared that, in doing so, those poets excluded the very essence of poetry, which is spontaneity and freedom; and in order to express plainly the ideal of their own art, they not only avoided any faithful description of nature and of their emotions, but they did away with description itself. They proceeded by suggestion. Instead of their actual thoughts and visions, they expressed only the symbols of them.

M. Pellissier takes great pains to be fair to the Symbolists and he succeeds well enough, better than many before him. The pages devoted to the revolution in the language of poetry seem to be done with special care. They deal with changes in the syntax, in the vocabulary (such as the attempt of the "romanistes" to use words of the Middle Ages), and changes especially in the versification. Everything is not new in the new poetry. The Symbolists were not the first to discover that: "plus il y a de règles, et plus les vers du grand poète ressemblent à ceux du rimeur; plus il y a de règles, et moins l'originalité personnelle trouve dans le rythme un moyen d'expression, moins le vers peut se diversifier, s'infléchir, s'approprier à l'idée ou au sentiment."

Nor were they the first to refuse to comply with strict rules. No sooner had Malherbes firmly established the classical construction of the "Alexandrin," than already the two most original verse writers of the seventeenth century, Racine and La Fontaine, proceeded to break it up. And when a new era in poetry

began, Victor Hugo again took up the work. Even the Parnassians were not too strict; Banville proved revolutionary.

This is true elsewhere as well. Verses of more than twelve syllables had been used before our time. Baff wrote some of fifteen (*vers bœiffins*). Verses of an odd number of syllables can be found in the sixteenth century and later, in Malherbe, in Scarron, in Voltaire, in Banville.

M. Pellissier might have found even "vers libres" previous to Gustave Kahn. Remy de Gourmont, in his essay on *Le Vers libre*, shows a kind of "vers libre" in Latin as early as the ninth century. In the same essay de Gourmont shows that the rule of the alternation of feminine and masculine rimes is of no avail so far as the ear is concerned; except the endings in nasals (*on, ent, ant*), there are no masculine rimes in French. Therefore the rule, of course given up by the Symbolists, had as a matter of fact been a simple illusion. If the masculine rime *seuil*, for instance, be supposed to alternate with the feminine rime *cueille*, only the eye can notice the difference. Let me add here that, while M. Pellissier approves of the fact ("et rien de mieux sans doute pourvu que nous puissions faire toujours une différence entre la poésie et la prose"), he refuses to go so far as to recognize the "vers libre." Now, several critics have observed that what is called "vers libre" almost always has some rhythm in it. De Gourmont gives a few striking examples. But it will suffice to read Paul Fort's "ballades en prose" to be soon convinced.

Chap. V. *La critique*: Contains not only a statement of the actual conditions of criticism, but a discussion of its nature. There are two opposed critical methods, dogmatism and impressionism. The great representative of the dogmatists is Brunetière, who, after Taine, though in an altogether different spirit, judges productions of literature according to a definite doctrine. An opposition that should exist, according to our author, between the doctrines of Brunetière and his method is not brought forth very clearly. We understand M. Pellissier better when he expounds the so-called application of "evolution" to literature as not amounting to much more than the introduction of some scientific terms into criticism. Who has ever doubted that an evolution took place in literature? I venture

to say that the idea, if not the word, had existed in the domain of literature long before it was introduced into that of the natural sciences. However that may be, the great weakness, as well as the strength, of Brunetière lies in his application of reason alone to his judgments in literature. He ignores, theoretically at least, taste and feeling as means of artistic appreciation.

Faguet's place is between the dogmatists and the impressionists. He understands and interprets admirably the authors with whom he is dealing. He has no theory of his own like Brunetière, he is free in his criticism. He is, however, too exclusively intellectual.

The two impressionists are Anatole France and J. Lemaitre; they do not enjoy literary works from the intellectual but from the artistic view-point. Sentiment, which does not deceive, is their criterion. This is especially the case with France, whose intellectual scepticism even makes him indifferent to an occasional self-contradiction. As to Lemaitre, his impressionism is often more apparent than real. "Il joue au scepticisme pour se préserver du pédantisme." He has a literary as well as a moral creed, but he does not declare it. His vigorous, though unjust, protest against the invasion of foreign literatures a few years ago would suffice to show that there are firmly established convictions between the ironist and the sceptic.

M. Pellissier, as said above, enters into a lengthy discussion of the superiority of those two kinds of criticism. Though not always very clear, his idea seems to be about this: a good impressionist must always be intelligent, and a good dogmatist must always prove that he has some literary taste—else neither would amount to anything. Sainte-Beuve was about the ideal. Our author seems particularly afraid of the triumph of dogmatism, for then, he says, "la critique ne consisterait plus que dans l'application des règles et l'application des règles dispenserait de talent." This argument is not very convincing. Suppose dogmatism were good, what would be the objection to it? Or, is there any advantage in having the criterion of good and bad art remain unconscious? That there is a criterion is a fact; otherwise there would be no superior or inferior criticism. M. Pellissier himself has shown that, under a good impressionism, there must be a theory of some kind or other.

Chap. VI. *L'histoire*. Naturalism has won here a great and decisive victory. History is no more to belong to literature. The scientific spirit in its treatment had already taken a firm hold on Taine and Renan. Neither of them, however, allowed himself to be bound altogether; the former used a strictly scientific method, but only to establish preconceived theories, especially to strengthen his attacks on the French revolution; the latter supplemented his scholarly researches, by drawing on his imagination wherever there was a gap in the documents. Fustel de Coulanges certainly went further in the same direction, but his syntheses were sometimes based on insufficient data. Sorel and Lavissee have both shown a spirit of great independence, the latter with a slightly moralizing touch.

M. Pellissier is very much inclined towards retaining history in the domain of art. You can hardly know all the facts, he says, and if you do, you cannot produce them all; you pick out those which go to prove your own personal views. "L'histoire, c'est la réalité vue à travers un tempérament." That may be true; but is it not the same in all sciences? Does not a biologist, or a philologist, pick out the facts that help him to enforce his theory on a subject? Are we going, therefore, to deny the name of science to biology, or to philology? It may be that historians will still for a long time be artists, but I venture to say that it will certainly not be from their own choice.

I have pointed out several times the lack of "vues d'ensemble" in the new volume of M. Pellissier. We miss them all the more, since a work of this kind ought to make them its principal object. Of course the author maintains that "individualism" is the salient feature of our modern literature. But this is altogether too easy. There are limits to individualism; and to say that individualism has developed is a different thing from saying that there is no connection worth noticing among all these individuals. My impression is that the lack of individuality is a very general accusation made against our epoch. Would there be such a gap between literature and life?

It is surely a commonplace idea that modern literature is in a perfect state of anarchy. But men of such wide reading as M. Pellissier ought to see beyond commonplace criticism. Only once in his book does he make an allu-

sion to what seems to him might be considered a universal trait: "Ce qui paraît au premier coup d'œil caractériser la période moderne, c'est une réaction contre le naturalisme." And even that he would retract as far as possible. Now, certainly the chief characteristic of French literature at the end of the nineteenth century was anti-naturalism. It does not everywhere appear at exactly the same time. In the novel and the drama, Naturalism still obtain, whereas for several years it had not existed in poetry. But everywhere the tendency to anti-naturalism prevails, everywhere it may be seen by whoever chooses to open his eyes.

This is not all; besides this negative current of contemporary French literature, positive standards, new ideals, have come in. But, except in the chapter on poetry, where it was impossible not to see it, M. Pellissier does not seem to have noticed any of them. Yet, not only do they exist, but they are all more or less connected. If our modern authors do not walk hand in hand, they march in the same direction. There is a wide range of *nuances*, but one idea; namely, instead of holding fast to dry realism, let us once more try idealism. It will not be the idealism of yore; it cannot be, for science has closed many paths formerly open to the imagination. It must be some other. Some writers have been very cautious not to commit themselves; they advocate only what has been called "une douce folie," like A. France in his novels, or like Rostand in his drama, they react against realism by playing with romantic ideals; or again, like Loti, they try to overcome the sad, hopeless reality by some fugitive sensations which induce, at least, temporary forgetfulness.

Some go further, they would not be content, by only deceiving themselves by artistic sensations, but, believing that science does not explain everything, they try to get hold of what is left untouched by it; they realize some æsthetic ideal which is almost necessarily vague and indefinite, but which nevertheless exists. Indeed, there are innumerable authors who have tried this. Poetry, rather than anything else, has been their field: there they have best succeeded in leaving their mark. Symbolism ought to be the central chapter of a book on contemporary French literature. Not because the productions of

this school are ahead of others—they perhaps are not—but because they express in the most characteristic manner the general aspirations of the new-comers. Instead of bringing out this special spirit, M. Pellissier devotes the greatest part of his chapter on poetry to the form of the new verses and poems, which, as can easily be seen, was a secondary result of the whole movement. He is not unjust to the symbolists, but he praises them timidly, and seems to understand their efforts with regret. In other chapters he does not so much as mention symbolist writers, he ignores them entirely. To give only a few examples. In the chapter on the drama, what mention is there of Villiers de l'Isle Adam, the author of *Axel*, and most of all of Maeterlinck? Nothing is said of Saint Pol Roux nor of Paul Claudel. In the chapter on the novel, Villiers de l'Isle Adam (*Nouvelle Eve*); de Régner, de Gourmont, Louys are ignored. M. Pellissier belongs himself to the generation of the realists and has accustomed himself to see only realists about him. His book is very characteristic from the point of view of its omissions. How was it possible not to speak of Mirbeau, the author of *Le jardin des supplices*, so much more original than Rod, Prévost, Pouvillon, Theuriet, and even Rosny?

It is the same ignorance of the aspiration of the young generation which leads M. Pellissier to pay so little attention to foreign literature in France. A page here and there is all he devotes to it. And yet its influence has been and still is great, owing to the fact that it possesses this note of peculiar mysticism favored by French authors as well.

Finally, another manifestation in literature, which again lies in the same line, and of which M. Pellissier does not say a word, is the alliance in the past years of several authors of mark with the Church. Not only have we the noisy Catholicism of Brunetière, but also a strong current towards upholding moral standards on religious principles, Bourget being the most illustrious example. (Huysmans has been mentioned by M. Pellissier.) This movement is far from new. As early as 1890 Jean Honcey called attention to it in a famous article in the *Revue Bleue* (Jan. 3, 1890): "Les chrétiens de lettres—le réveil religieux en France."

These few remarks will be enough to show

that there is more unity than is generally admitted in contemporary French literature, that the book of M. Pellissier ought to have expressed this unity and would thus have escaped the danger of being, in so many parts, nothing but a mere catalogue of appreciations on the work of different authors.

ALBERT SCHINZ.

Bryn Mawr College.

GERMAN LITERATURE.

Lessings Hamburgische Dramaturgie.

Abridged and edited with introduction and notes by CHARLES HARRIS. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1901. xl+356 pp.

MOODS and tastes and fashions change. Is it true that we fancy the same kind of a school edition we did twenty-five or fifty years ago? Can a given text be edited in but one way and in no other? Is it hazardous to deviate from the time-hallowed and petrified method? These are some of the questions we ask ourselves after a perusal of the above edition. The *Hamburgische Dramaturgie* has never been edited in this country before. How gratifying it would have been to find the new dressed up in new clothes! Why increase the number of text-books upon the shelves of teachers and professors, in general a mere aggregation of staleness and dullness, most of them born of the desire to edit some book or other, few of them begotten of genuine enthusiasm and profound interest?

From the point of view of greater independence on the part of the student in the pursuit of his work, little can be said in favor of most introductions to the classics. Instead of teaching the student reliance upon himself, instead of leaving him to grapple with the subject alone, and instead of giving him an opportunity to run it down in hours of vigorous absorbed attention, it offers him certain ready-made results prepared by the teacher, permitting him to take the information by an almost effortless contact with it. The same thing may be said of Prof. Harris' Introduction.

A further abridgment of the text would have been profitable. As long as translation monopolized the bulk of the student's time in and out of the class-room, and facility in translation was regarded as a sufficient index of intellectual power, it may have been feasible to

cover a large amount of material in the recitation period. But now that that highly specialized and one-sided method is losing ground, only a portion of the hour is devoted to it and more time is left for a thorough discussion of the text. This method of procedure would also leave the student with more time for individual study upon assigned portions of the book not found in the edition he is using and would serve to emancipate him from an altogether too servile acquiescence in the editor's and instructor's standpoint.

Prof. Harris observes the strictest silence with regard to the end to be obtained by the study of the *Hamburgische Dramaturgie*. In the Preface to his edition, he conscientiously records that the Lachmann-Muncker edition is the basis of the text, that a few typographical errors have been corrected, that the Prussian rules have been followed in the orthography, that passages have been omitted and explained, but says not a word concerning the motive for editing the work. Nor does the Introduction contain a clear enunciation of the design of the work. In fact some of the statements made here offer us plausible arguments for not reading it at all. It may be contended that I have torn Prof. Harris' sentences from their connection and have twisted them to suit my own purpose. Granted that this has been done. My aim is simply to show that objections can be raised and are being raised to admitting the *Hamburgische Dramaturgie* to the class-room at all, and, therefore, Prof. Harris should at least have made a definite reference to that fact.

1. The *Hamburgische Dramaturgie* lacks unity of purpose. On p. xviii Prof. Harris says: "It is, in a way, a haphazard production." 2. There is much in it that is worthless. On p. xviii we read:

"If we were compelled to judge the *Dramaturgie* by the number of pages which are well nigh worthless to-day, we should consider it of little value."

Any one who will take the pains to read the little book of Friedrich Seiler, *Der Gegenwartswert der Hamburgischen Dramaturgie*, Berlin, Weidmann, 1901, will easily be convinced that it has less actual intrinsic worth than Prof. Harris is here willing to admit. 3. Out of fifty-two plays criticized only eighteen were German and "of these eighteen it is fair to say that only Lessing's *Miss Sara Sampson*

is of interest to the cultivated reader of to-day." How profitable to read the criticism of worthless plays! We may not assume that the student has read any of the French plays examined by the reviewer Lessing. The student is entirely dependent upon Lessing's prejudice against the French and, perhaps, the prejudice of his instructor also. There is surely no justice in such a one-sided procedure. 4. "As it stands, the *Hamburgische Dramaturgie* is not to be taken blindly as the deliberate statement of his own views," p. xxvi. What are his serious convictions? Will the editor leave the student in a state of confusion? 5. One of the most important topics discussed has no present value. P. xxxiii:

"For both the English and the German reader this keen discussion of the unities has no present importance; for the former, because the example of the great dramatists of the Elizabethan age made such a discussion unnecessary; for the other, because Lessing's victory was complete in his own country."

P. xxxv:

"The lapse of time and the shifting of the point of view makes much that was most valuable in the *Dramaturgie* for its day of less worth to us."

P. xxxvi: "Indeed his own mature dramas are in part flat contradictions of the theories of the Greek philosopher," Aristotle.

These statements of a derogatory character are hardly balanced by others of a more encouraging nature. P. xviii we read: "we might question whether any other critical work has ever surpassed it." P. xix: "As regards vocabulary, inflection and syntactical construction Lessing's language is a rich and comparatively unworked mine." P. xxxi:

"Lessing's interpretation (of Aristotle) holds in the main: in a few points the consensus of opinion is against him, in others it is fair to assume that no agreement will ever be reached."

P. xxxvi: "The *Dramaturgie* does in passing touch upon a considerable body of theory in a way that gives to it enduring value." P. xxxix: "a noteworthy pamphlet of a literary campaign." P. xl: "The superadded something of which this Introduction can give no account is the touch of genius which makes imperishable."

Janus-like we find ourselves looking in two directions at the same time, standing between two fires. What shall we do with the book? Let us assume for a moment

that there are no serious objections to be raised to the study of the book, that only the most favorable comment can be made upon it. Even then we should be at sea; for the passages last cited suggest many different methods of study. Shall we study Lessing's critical method? Shall we devote ourselves solely to philological considerations? Shall we make the æsthetic theories of the unities and of fear and pity, etc., the subject of our investigations? Or shall we treat it from the point of view of history? If the Introduction is to be made a *pons asinorum* for the instructor as well as for the student in any case, why fail to make even a suggestion as to didactic possibilities?

Strikingly strange is the fact that the editor nowhere designates the class of students by whom the *Hamburgische Dramaturgie* might profitably be read. The only hint as to the previous preparation of students is given in a paragraph prefatory to the notes, in which Prof. Harris says, that an acquaintance with the life of Lessing and the most general facts of German literature are assumed. Such a regulation would debar many students otherwise eligible; for few students possess, or can be expected to possess, the biographical and historical knowledge which the editor regards as essential. In the case of such students it would have been fair to suggest where the suitable material may be found.

Some passages of the original have been omitted. The reason given for the omission is very unsatisfactory. Everything is excluded that seemed to the editor of little or no present value and interest. To relieve himself of all responsibility in the matter of selection, it would have been wiser to say, that the retention or rejection of a chapter was largely influenced by the example of German editors. If, however, the work of choosing was done independently of his predecessors, an illustration of his method of choice would have been welcome.

As introductions go, the Introduction covering thirty pages is well done. Looking toward perspicuity, much would have been gained by a separation of the different portions of it into chapters with appropriate titles. Pp. ix to xxii touch upon the genesis of the *Hamburgische*

Dramaturgie. The aim of the remaining pages is to give an insight into its purpose. Lessing's original plan was to criticize the plays represented, and also to pass judgment upon the merit or demerit of the actor's interpretation. But the perversity of the players compelled Lessing to dispense with the histrionic phase of his reviews. The mediocrity of some of the dramas often served merely as a starting-point for the discussion of serious dramatic principles. The paragraph which refers to the *Dramaturgie* as a prose master-piece (p. xviii) is an episode in the consistent development of the essay and ought, therefore, to have been introduced elsewhere. In his treatment of the *Dramaturgie* as a polemic against French tragedy, against Gottsched as the representative of French taste in Germany, against Corneille and Voltaire, the editor's attitude toward Gottsched, whose service to German literature has been underestimated since Lessing's time and is just beginning to be appreciated, is the attitude of prejudiced tradition. His collocation of the passages referring to Shakespere is valuable; it would have been more pedagogical to permit the student to make the collocation for himself. The question of the inquiring student, "what theories are held to-day with reference to tragedy" is left entirely unanswered. There is hardly a hint anywhere that there are *modern* problems of the tragedy. The omission of any mention of the name Bernays in connection with the question of *purification*, of such books as Theodor Lipps, *Der Streit über die Tragödie*, Hamburg and Leipzig, 1891, or Johannes Volkelt, *Ästhetik des Tragischen*, München, 1897, books very helpful and indispensable to the maturer student in case of a desired orientation, marks a sad and inexplicable neglect. The editor had a splendid opportunity to explain the doctrine of *art for art's sake*, but failed to grasp it, and so the obscurity of the phrase will continue to be a source of perplexity to the student.

But few typographical errors are to be found. The notes are trustworthy in almost every instance, and in only a few cases have translations been offered where the dictionary would have served just as well.

J. A. C. HILDNER.

University of Michigan.

(1) *BEOWULF'S CHARACTER.*

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES,

SIRS:—John R. Clark Hall, in his prose translation of *Beowulf* (1901), pp. 189 ff., has presented a sketch of the hero's character, at the close of which he briefly refers to its "darker side." "In some respects," he observes, "it is evident that his ethical standard was low; for he takes great credit to himself for not having sworn many false oaths or murdered his relatives (2738-2740)."

It would be a pity, indeed, if *Beowulf* had sworn some false oaths, and it would be surprising, to say the least, if in the face of death he should have derived comfort from the thought that they were only few in number. Dr. Hall's plea that in fulfilling "the sacred duty" of vengeance (*þæt hē his frēond wrece*, 1385) "the custom of the times permitted every sort of treachery" is not particularly convincing as applied to this case; for if the code of honor sanctioned such behavior, there would be no cause for any uneasy feeling about it. But happily for the hero, his reputation has suffered merely through inadequate interpretation: no, *Beowulf* was no *wærloga*! When the messenger announced to the *Gēats* the death of their lord,—*hē ne lēag fela wyrda ne worda*, l. 3029, who can doubt that he kept strictly to the truth? In the same way, (*ic*) *ne mē swōr fela āða on unriht* in the mouth of the dying *Beowulf* means quite the same as 'I kept all my oaths.' Similarly, *lȳt swigian*, 2897, is 'not be silent at all,' 'speak out;' *lȳthwōn lēan*, 203='heartily approve;' *mæte weorode*, *Dream of the Rood* 69, 124='alone'; and when we are told that *Unferð—his mægum nāre ārfæst æt ecga gelācum*, *Beow.* 1167, we are to understand that he—[his] *brōðrum tō banan wurde, hēafodmægum* (587); and possibly some of us will be put in mind of 'The cunning speech of *Drumtochty*'? There is no need of further exemplifying the use of *Litotes* by the Anglo-Saxon poets.

As to the shortcomings of *Beowulf* the hero, there is without question one serious defect—though not a moral blemish—of which his most ardent admirers could not acquit him: he talks too much! But, then, this is a common constitutional fault of the poem.

(2) *CHAUCER'S BOOK OF THE DUCHESS* 405 ff.

For hit was on to beholde,

As thogh the erthe envye wolde
To be gayer than the heven,
To have mo floures, swiche seven
As in the welken sterres be.

[Based on ll. 8465 ff. of the *Roman de la Rose*:

Qu'il vous fust avis que la terre
Vosist entreprendre estrif et guerre
Au ciel d'estre miex estelée,
Tant iert par ses flors revelée.]

In the *Globe* Chaucer, H. Frank Heath changes *swiche seven* to *sithes seven*, arguing that the former "makes no sense." This is an emendation at once needless and grammatically impossible. The *as* of the following line clearly warns the critical reader that the correlative *swiche* cannot be dropped without serious syntactical consequences.¹ It is true, Skeat's explanation of the MSS. reading is more confusing than helpful. "To have more flowers than the heaven (has stars, so as even to rival) seven such planets as there are in the sky." But if we just leave the planets out of the interpretation, everything is as smooth as it could be. *Swiche seven* means precisely what it should mean in this context: ['seven such,' that is] 'seven times as (much, or) many.' Cf. Robert of Gloucester, p. 19, l. 8: *For heo hadde suche þritti men as were on þe oþer*. (From Mätzner's *Grammar* iii, p. 232, where other examples are mentioned.) That this idiom is inherited from the Old English period, may be seen from 'Leechdoms' i, 400.17 *selle him twā swylc swylce man æt him nime* (quoted by Toller); cf. *ōðer swylc*, as in *Beowulf* 1582 f.: *fýstfýne men—ōðer swylc*.

The meaning of ll. 407 f. is thus simply: 'to have more flowers, [even] seven times as many as there are stars in the heaven.'

Regarding the introduction of the numerical element, which may largely be due to the exigencies of the rime (cf. *Canterb. Tales*, G 974: *Though it as greet were as was Ninivee, Rome, Alisaundre, Troye, and othere three*), but at the same time intensifies the comparison, we refer to our monograph *Das Bild bei Chaucer*, pp. 360, 385 f.

FREDERICK KLAEBER.

University of Minnesota.

¹ On the other hand, *Troil.* v. 1380:

Which with your cominge hoom ayen to Troye
Ye may redresse, and, more a thousand sythe
Than ever ich hadde, encreasen in me joye.

COMPOSITION WORK IN MODERN LANGUAGES.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES,

SIRS:—It is unnecessary to discuss the value and usefulness of Composition work in the class-room. No up-to-date teacher would dare claim that it suffices for his students to be able to translate French or German into English. If modern languages are to be called upon to take up the task of Greek and Latin in adorning and disciplining the minds of young people, while improving their knowledge of their native tongue, the rôle of Composition will become still more important, for it is especially through this kind of work that these various aims will be attained.

It is also a well-known fact that Composition is unpopular at large. The best proof of it is that, out of four or five hours a week devoted to French or German, only one hour is grudgingly set aside in most schools for the translation of English into the foreign language to be acquired.

But why is composition so unpopular with both teachers and pupils, while translation of the foreign language into English is generally liked?

Because the former is done at the wrong time; it is done too early. Because the pupils have had no time to assimilate the rules to be applied and the words to be used. They find the translation of French or German into English comparatively easy, pleasant and profitable, because their command of the English lightens the work. They dislike Composition and find it hard, uninteresting and unprofitable because they have no vocabulary to depend upon and are obliged to stumble along groping their way in the dark, because it is mechanical, and they feel, as one of my colleagues puts it, like children playing with blocks of wood.

Let us illustrate the case; let us visit a French class, for instance, as taught through the present system. To make things very plain, suppose it is the first lesson in Grammar, either in a high school or a university, for the method will vary but little, if any.

The teacher will probably explain the rules with as great a display of knowledge as possible, although, by the way, it would be much

easier for him and better for the members of his class if he would manage to make them find out these very rules by means of a few well-chosen examples. Next, he reads the vocabulary and the French text; he may go so far as to ask the pupils to repeat what he has just read, and finally he assigns the lesson for the next day: 1. the study of the rules; 2. of the words of the vocabulary; 3. the translation at sight, or on paper, of the French text into English and 4. the translation on paper of the English into French.

In the next recitation, the translation of the French sentences will go on smoothly, but not so with that of the English. Whatever system may be selected to correct it, the numerous mistakes will tax the patience of the master and, worse than that, will breed dislike and distrust in the minds of the students. This kind of work will be carried on for one or two years on the same plan, the number of mistakes and the dissatisfaction of the whole class increasing in a direct ratio as they proceed.

Now, how can we remedy this state of affairs? How can we make Composition work attractive? Shall we postpone it to the second semester, or the second year as is advised by some German scholars? It would certainly be better to do so than to adhere to the present method? But we do not need to postpone it to so late a date. Composition work may go hand in hand almost from the beginning with Grammar and translation of French into English.

This is how it can be done: Whatever book the teacher uses, let him first go carefully over the rules, the vocabulary and the French text of every exercise; if there is any spare time, let him devote it to a thorough review of the preceding exercises, *leaving entirely aside the English sentences until he reaches, say, the tenth or the twelfth lesson.*

By this time, the horizon of the pupil will have been broadened; he will have met again and again with the application of the rules of the first lesson; he will have heard, repeated and translated so many times the words of the first vocabulary that he will have mastered them; he will have assimilated them to such a degree that they will look almost as familiar to him as expressions of his own language.

When this stage has been reached, the time has come to make him translate the English sentences of the first lesson. First, ask him to do it at sight. It will be a good drill for him in the pronunciation of words he knows, in the application of principles he has already grasped, in the immediate use of moods, tenses and endings with which he is thoroughly acquainted. He will translate them all in a very short time, unhesitatingly, intelligently, pleased with the idea that he is able to express English ideas in the new language in such an easy way. Confidence—the most important feeling to create and to develop in a class—is aroused at once. Frequent reviews will materially increase it.

The teacher should then ask his class to write out the translation of the English sentences for the next day in order to make sure that they know the spelling of the words and to impress still better the expressions on their minds. Whether he corrects the Composition exercise at home, or on the board in the class room, or dictates his own translation, his task will be very light, for the mistakes will be few. His pupils will be able to apply rules and words in an intelligent way because the principles will have ripened in their minds and they will have a small but sufficient vocabulary at hand.

It is hardly necessary to add that the study of rules and French texts should be kept two or three weeks ahead of the Composition work throughout the year and chances for reviewing should be generously offered.

If the above suggestions are followed, Composition work will no longer be the "bête noire" of teachers and students. They will be elated with the success of their efforts and the road before them will be smooth and alluring.

VICTOR E. FRANÇOIS.

University of Michigan.

REFERENCE BOOKS FOR FRENCH.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES,

SIRS:—I have only just seen the review of my *Books of reference for students and teachers of French* published in the January number of your journal. Allow me to say that, in my opinion, your critic hardly makes it sufficiently

clear to your readers what the scope and purpose of the book is. The last paragraph of his review might indeed lead them to conclude that it aimed at covering the same ground as the well-known and valuable books of Koschwitz (*Anleitung zum Studium der französischen Philologie*) and Rossmann (*Ein Studienaufenthalt in Paris*). This is not the case. My book differs from theirs in not giving any instructions as to the object and methods of the scientific and practical study of French: it contains a list, accompanied in many cases by brief appreciative or critical remarks, of such books on French language, literature, and life in its various aspects as students and teachers will do well to refer to.

The list is divided into twenty-eight chapters with the following headings: Bibliographies; Encyclopædias; Periodicals; Literature generally; Books and Manuscripts; Collections of extracts; French folklore; Language generally; Phonetics; History of the French language; Old French; French dialects; Provençal; the teaching of French; French pronunciation; French spelling; Modern French grammar; various hand books for the study of French; Colloquial French; French composition; French dictionaries; French metre; Education in France; French society, institutions and manners; French history; French art; Geography of France.

I have endeavoured to include in my list all such publications (especially such written in French, English, and German) as will be most helpful to students and teachers, without desiring to provide a bibliography for scholars pursuing research in any particular branch of the study of French. I do not doubt that my selection could be improved by omissions as well as additions, nor do I expect the book to be free from errors, either material or typographical.

I wish, therefore, in conclusion to repeat what I said in the preface of my publication: that any corrections from persons interested in the study of French will be gratefully received and used by me to improve the book, should a second edition of it become necessary.

E. G. W. BRAUNHOLTZ.

37, Chesterton Road,
Cambridge, England.